arXiv:1407.3028v2 [math.OC] 10 Dec 2014

Hidden Stochastic Games and Limit Equilibrium Payoffs

Jérôme Renault*, Bruno Ziliotto*

December 11, 2014

Abstract

We consider 2-player stochastic games with perfectly observed actions, and study the limit, as the discount factor goes to one, of the equilibrium payoffs set. In the usual setup where current states are observed by the players, we first show that the set of *stationary* equilibrium payoffs always converges. We then provide the first examples where the whole set of equilibrium payoffs diverges. The construction can be robust to perturbations of the payoffs, and to the introduction of normal-form correlation. Next we naturally introduce the more general model of hidden stochastic game, where the players publicly receive imperfect signals over current states. In this setup we present a last example where not only the limit set of equilibrium payoffs does not exist, but there is no converging selection of equilibrium payoffs. The example is symmetric and robust in many aspects, in particular to the introduction of extensive-form correlation or communication devices. No uniform equilibrium payoff exists, and the equilibrium set has full support for each discount factor and each initial state.

1 Introduction

Most economic and social interactions have a dynamic aspect, and equilibrium plays of dynamic games are typically not obtained by successions of myopic equilibria of the current one-shot interaction, but need to take into account both the effects of actions over current payoffs, and over future payoffs in the continuation game. In this paper we consider dynamic games with 2 players[1], where the actions taken by the players are perfectly observed at the end of every stage. We denote by E_δ, resp. E'_δ, the set of Nash equilibrium payoffs, resp. sequential equilibrium payoffs, of the δ-discounted game, and we write E_∞ for the set of

*TSE (GREMAQ, Université Toulouse 1 Capitole), 21 allée de Brienne, 31000 Toulouse, France. Both authors gratefully acknowledge the support of the Agence Nationale de la Recherche, under grant ANR JEUDY, ANR-10-BLAN 0112, and thank J. Bolte, T. Mariotti and T. Tomala for fruitful discussions.

[1]This simplifies the exposition, but our results extend to the n-player case.

uniform equilibrium payoffs of the dynamic game. We mainly study the limit[2] of E'_δ as players get extremely patient, i.e. as the discount factor goes to one.

In a repeated game, the dynamic interaction consists of the repetition of a given one-shot game, and we have the standard Folk Theorems, with pioneering work from the seventies by Aumann and Shapley, and Rubinstein. Regarding sequential equilibrium payoffs, the Folk theorem of Fudenberg and Maskin (1986) implies that for generic payoff functions, E'_δ converges to the set of feasible and individually rational payoffs of the one-shot game, and Wen (1994) showed how to adapt the notion of individually rational payoffs to obtain a Folk theorem without genericity assumption. Without assumptions on the payoffs, E_∞ coincides with the set of feasible and individually rational payoffs of the one-shot game, and the set of Nash equilibrium payoffs E_δ also converges to this set (see Sorin (1986)). These results have been generalized in many ways to games with imperfectly observed actions (see e.g. Abreu *et al.* (1990), Fudenberg Levine (1991), Fudenberg Levine Maskin (1994), Fudenberg *et al.* (2007), Lehrer (1990, 1992a, 1992b), or Renault Tomala (2004, 2011)), but this is beyond the scope of the present paper.

Stochastic games were introduced by Shapley (1953) and generalize repeated games: the payoff functions of the players evolve from stage to stage, and depend on a state variable observed by the players, whose evolution is influenced by the players' actions. In the zero-sum case, Bewley and Kohlberg (1976) proved the existence of the limit of the discounted value (hence of E_δ and E'_δ) when δ goes to one. An example of Sorin (1984) shows that in the general-sum case $\lim_{\delta\to 1} E_\delta$ and E_∞ may be non-empty and disjoint. Vieille (2000) proved that E_∞ is always non-empty, that is there exists a uniform equilibrium payoff[3].

Regarding discounted equilibrium payoffs in stochastic games, several Folk theorems have been proved under various assumptions. Dutta (1995) assumes that the set of long-run feasible payoffs is independent of the initial state, has full dimension, and that minmax long-run payoffs also do not depend on the initial state. Fudenberg[4] and Yamamoto (2011) assume that the stochastic game is irreducible (all players but one can always drive the current state where they want, possibly in many stages, with positive probability). Hörner *et al.* (2011) generalize the recursive methods of Fudenberg Levine Maskin (1994) to compute a limit equilibrium set in stochastic games with imperfect public monitoring when this limit set does not depend on the initial state (this happens when the Markov chain induced by any Markov strategy profile is irreducible).

All the above assumptions somehow require that the stochastic game does not depend too much on the initial state, and in particular forbid the existence of

[2]for the Hausdorff distance, defined as $d(A,B) = \max\{\max_{a\in A} d(a,B), \max_{b\in B} d(b,A)\}$ for A and B non-empty compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$. $d(A,B) \leq \varepsilon$ means that: every point in A is at a distance at most ε from a point in B, and conversely.

[3]The generalization of this result to more players is a well-known open question in dynamic games.

[4]Fudenberg and Yamamoto 2011, as well as Hörner *et al.* (2011), consider the more general case of imperfect public monitoring.

multiple absorbing[5] states with different equilibrium payoffs. We believe that it is also meaningful to study stochastic games where the actions taken can have irreversible effects on future plays. This is the case in many situations, for example in stopping games when each player only acts once and has to decide when to do so, or when the actions partially represent investment decisions, or extractions of exhaustible resources.

The first contributions of our paper concern 2-player stochastic games with finitely many states and actions. We first prove that the set of *stationary*[6] equilibrium payoffs of the discounted game always converges to a non-empty set. As a consequence, there always exists a selection of E'_δ which converges. Secondly, we show that the convergence property cannot be extended to the Nash or sequential equilibrium payoffs sets by providing the first examples of stochastic games where neither E_δ nor E'_δ converges: the limit of the equilibrium set may simply not exist in a stochastic game. Our first example is robust to the introduction of normal-form correlation, and our second example shows that the non convergence property can be robust to small perturbations of the payoffs. However we point out that both examples are not robust to the introduction of an extensive-form correlation device. In each case, the set of equilibrium payoffs has empty interior for any discount factor, and the limits of converging selections of E'_δ coincide with the uniform equilibrium payoffs. In these examples, we believe that the elements of the limit set of stationary equilibrium payoffs emerge as natural outcomes of the game played by extremely patient players.

In the rest of the paper we introduce the more general model of *hidden* stochastic games, and we refer to the above original model as *standard* stochastic games. In a hidden stochastic game, the players still perfectly observe past actions but no longer perfectly observe current states, and rather receive at the beginning of every stage a public, possibly random, signal on the current state. So players have incomplete information over the sequence of states, but this information is common to both players. Note that in the zero-sum case this model was considered in Gimbert et al. [13]. Hidden stochastic games are generalizations of hidden Markov decision processes (where there is a single agent), hence the name. Hidden stochastic games also generalize repeated games with common incomplete information on the state. We believe this model is meaningful in many interactions where the fundamentals are not perfectly known to the players. We present in particular two examples of economic interactions that could be modeled as a hidden stochastic game. The first example is a Cournot competition on a market for a natural exhaustible resource, where the players have common incomplete information on the stock of natural resources remaining. The second example is an oligopoly competition with a single good (e.g., traditional tv sets) where

[5]When an absorbing state is reached, the play will remain forever in that state, no matter the actions played.

[6]A stationary strategy of a player plays after every history a mixed action which only depends on the current state.

the state variable includes parameters known to the firms, such as the current demand level, but also parameters imperfectly known such as the trend of the market or the overall state of the economy.

Surprisingly enough, few papers have already considered stochastic games with imperfect observation of the state. In the zero-sum context, Venel (2012) studied hidden stochastic games where the players do not receive any signal on the state during the game, and proves under a commutativity assumption over transitions the existence of the limit value, as well as the stronger notion of uniform value (corresponding to uniform equilibrium payoffs). Ziliotto (2013) showed that the commutativity assumption was needed for Venel's result, and provided an example of a zero-sum hidden stochastic game[7] with payoffs in $[0,1]$ where the δ-discounted value oscillates between $1/2$ and $5/9$ when δ goes to one.

Given parameters ε in $(0,5/12)$ and r in $(0,\varepsilon/5)$, we provide an example of a 2-player hidden stochastic game with all payoffs in $[0,1]$, four actions for each player, having the following features:

- the game is symmetric between the players,

- the players have incomplete information over the current state, but the public signals received are informative enough for the players to know the current stage payoff functions at the beginning of every stage. As a consequence, the players know their current payoffs during the play.

- there are 13 states, and for any initial state and discount factor the set of sequential equilibrium payoffs contains a square with side $2r$, hence has full dimension.

- for a specific initial state k_1, there exist subsets Δ_1 and Δ_2 of discount factors, both containing 1 as a limit point, such that for all discount factors in Δ_1, the corresponding set of sequential equilibrium payoffs is exactly the square E_1 centered in (ϵ,ϵ) with side $2r$, whereas for all discount factors in Δ_2, the set[8] of sequential equilibrium payoffs is the square E_2 centered in $(1-\epsilon,1-\epsilon)$ with side $2r$. In each case the associated square is also the set of Nash equilibrium payoffs, the set of (normal or extensive-form) correlated equilibrium payoffs, and the set of communication[9] equilibrium payoffs of the discounted game. Since these two squares are disjoint, there is no converging selection of equilibrium payoffs, and the game has no uniform equilibrium payoff.

Moreover the example is robust to small perturbations of the payoffs: if one perturbs all payoffs of the game by at most $\frac{1}{2}r(\varepsilon-5r)$, the set of discounted equilibrium payoffs of the perturbed game with initial state k_1 still does not converge, no converging selection of equilibrium payoffs exists and there is no uniform equi-

[7]The example of Ziliotto provides a negative answer to two conjectures of Mertens (1986) for zero-sum dynamic games.

[8]As an illustration, if $\varepsilon=.3$ and $r=.05$, for any discount factor in Δ_1 the set of equilibrium payoffs is the square $E_1=[.25,.35]^2$, and for any discount in Δ_2 the set of equilibrium payoffs is the square $E_2=[.65,.75]^2$.

[9] introduced in Myerson, 1986 and Forges, 1986.

librium payoff.

Our last example is thus robust in many aspects, and it seems impossible to affect to this game a reasonable limit equilibrium payoff. The model of hidden stochastic games may be seen as a small departure from the standard model of stochastic game, but it seems very difficult for an expert to find any good answer to the informal question: "The game being played by extremely patient players, which outcome is likely to form ?"

We study standard stochastic games in section 2. Hidden stochastic games are introduced in section 3, and our last example is presented in section 4. The construction elaborates and improves on the zero-sum construction of Ziliotto (2013). The presentation is done here in 5 progressive steps, starting with a Markov chain on $[0,1]$, then a Markov Decision Process, then a zero-sum stochastic game with infinite state space, a zero-sum hidden stochastic game and a final example. A few proofs are relegated to the Appendix.

We denote respectively by $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+$ the sets of non negative integers, real numbers and non negative real numbers.

2 Standard Stochastic Games

We consider a 2-player stochastic game. Let K, I and J respectively be the finite sets of states, actions for player 1 and actions for player 2. k_1 in K is the initial state, u_1 and u_2 are the state dependent utility functions from $K \times I \times J$ to $\mathbb{R}$, and q is the transition function from $K \times I \times J$ to $\Delta(K)$, the set of probabilities over K. At every period $t \geq 1$ players first learn the current state $k_t \in K$ and simultaneously select actions $i_t \in I$ and $j_t \in J$. These actions are then publicly observed, the stage payoffs are $u_1(k_t, i_t, j_t)$ for player 1 and $u_2(k_t, i_t, j_t)$ for player 2, a new state k_{t+1} is selected according to the distribution $q(k_t, i_t, j_t)$, and the play goes to the next period. Given a discount factor δ in $[0,1)$, the δ-discounted stochastic game is the infinite horizon game where player 1 and player 2's payoffs are respectively $(1-\delta)\sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\delta^{t-1}u_1(k_t,i_t,j_t)$ and $(1-\delta)\sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\delta^{t-1}u_2(k_t,i_t,j_t)$.

Let E_δ and E'_δ respectively denote the set of Nash equilibrium payoffs and the set of perfect[10] equilibrium payoffs of the δ-discounted stochastic game. Standard fixed-point arguments show the existence of a stationary equilibrium in this game, and the associated equilibrium payoff lies in E'_δ and E_δ. In this paper, we are mainly interested in the asymptotic behavior of these sets when players become more and more patient, i.e. we will look for their limit[11] when δ goes to

[10] subgame-perfect equilibrium, or equivalently here, sequential equilibrium, or equivalently perfect public equilibrium, as defined in Fudenberg Levine Maskin 1994 for repeated games with perfect public monitoring and extended to stochastic games in Fudenberg Yamamoto 2011.

[11] All limits of sets in the paper are to be understood for the Hausdorff distance between

1. And we will also briefly consider the set E_∞ of uniform equilibrium[12] payoffs of the stochastic game.

When there is a single state, the game is a standard repeated game with perfect monitoring, and we have well-known Folk Theorems.

For zero-sum stochastic games, Shapley (1953) proved that the value v_δ exists and players have stationary optimal strategies, so E_δ and E'_δ are singletons. Bewley and Kohlberg (1976) proved the convergence of v_δ (hence, of E_δ and E'_δ) using algebraic arguments[13].

The following proposition shows how the Bewley Kohlberg result extends to general-sum games. Denote by E''_δ the set of *stationary* equilibrium payoffs of the δ-discounted game. In the zero-sum case, $E_\delta = E'_\delta = E''_\delta$. In general, stationary equilibria are very simple equilibria where the strategies of the players are particularly restricted, and E''_δ is a subset of E'_δ.

Proposition 2.1. *There exists a non-empty compact set E such that:*

$$E''_\delta \xrightarrow[\delta \to 1]{} E.$$

In the case of repeated games (a single state), E reduces to the set of mixed Nash equilibrium payoffs of the one-shot game, hence may not be convex. The proof of proposition 2.1 is in the Appendix and largely relies on the semi-algebraicity of the set of discount factors and associated stationary equilibria and payoffs. As stated here, it holds for any 2-player stochastic game with finitely many states and actions, but the proof easily extends to the n-player case. As a consequence, using a point in E one can construct a selection of $(E'_\delta)_\delta$ which converges, i.e. it is possible to select, for each discount δ, a perfect equilibrium payoff x_δ of the corresponding game in a way such that x_δ has a limit when δ goes to one.

Corollary 2.2. *There exists a converging selection of $(E'_\delta)_\delta$.*

This corollary can also be easily deduced from Mertens Sorin Zamir (1994, Lemma 2.2 in chapter 7) and Neyman (2003, Theorem 5), who have proved the existence of a semi-algebraic selection of E''_δ. Because payoffs are bounded, this selection converges.

It is then now natural to ask if the convergence property of proposition 2.1 also holds for E_δ and E'_δ. We conclude this section by providing the first examples of stochastic games where these sets of equilibrium payoffs diverge.

non-empty compact sets of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

[12]Throughout the paper, we say that a vector u in $\mathbb{R}^2$ is a uniform equilibrium payoff if for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a strategy profile such that for all high enough discount factors, the profile is a ε-Nash equilibrium of the discounted game with payoff ε-close to u, see Sorin 1986, Mertens Sorin and Zamir 1994 or Vieille 2000 for related definitions.

[13]Recently, Bolte *et al.* (2013) extended this algebraic approach to a class of stochastic games with infinite action sets.

Proposition 2.3. *There exists a 2-player stochastic game where neither E_δ nor E'_δ converge. The construction can be robust to perturbations of the payoffs, and to the introduction of normal-form correlation.*

To prove the proposition, we first present a simple example (Example 2.4 below) where E_δ and E'_δ diverge, and which is robust to the introduction of normal-form correlation. Then we provide a more elaborate example (Example 2.7) which is robust to perturbations of the payoffs.

Example 2.4. Consider the stochastic game represented by the following picture.



$$\begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{cc} L & R \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} T \\ B \end{array} & \left(\begin{array}{cc} (1,0) \circlearrowleft & (-1,-1)^* \\ (-1,-1)^* & (0,1)^* \end{array} \right) \end{array}$$

There are 7 states: k_1 (the initial state), k_2, k_3 and 4 absorbing states: $(1/2,0)^*$, $(0,1/2)^*$, $(-1,-1)^*$ and $(0,1)^*$. When an absorbing state $(a,b)^*$ is reached, the game stays there forever and at each stage the payoffs to player 1 and player 2 are respectively a and b. The sets of actions are $I = \{T, B\}$ for player 1 and $J = \{L, R\}$ for player 2. The transition from state k_1 only depends on player 1's action, as indicated in the above figure, and similarly the transition from state k_2 only depends on player 2's action. If in state k_3 the action profile (T, L) is played, the vector payoff is $(1, 0)$ and the play remains in k_3. To conclude the description, we have to specify the payoffs in states k_1, k_2, and k_3. The payoff in k_1 is $(1/2, 0)$ if T is played and $(1/2, 1/2)$ if B is played. The payoff in state k_2 does not depend on the actions played and is $(1/2, 1/2)$, and the payoffs in state k_3 are simply given by the bimatrix $\left(\begin{array}{cc} (1,0) & (-1,-1) \\ (-1,-1) & (0,1) \end{array} \right)$.

For each discount, it is clear that $(1/2, 0)$ is in E_δ, and the question is whether there are other equilibrium payoffs, for instance $(1/2, 1/2)$.

First consider any δ in $[0,1)$, and a Nash equilibrium (σ,τ) of the δ-discounted stochastic game with equilibrium payoff (x,y). Because Player 1 can play T in the initial state, $x \geq 1/2$. Because the sum of payoffs never exceeds 1, we have $x+y \leq 1$. Assume now that under (σ,τ) the state k_3 has positive probability to be reached, and denote by (x_3,y_3) the discounted payoffs induced by (σ,τ) given that k_3 is reached. We have $x_3 \geq 1/2$, because player 1 will not accept to play B at k_1 if he obtains a payoff lower than $1/2$ afterwards. Similarly, $y_3 \geq 1/2$. Since $x_3+y_3 \leq 1$, we get $x_3 = y_3 = 1/2$, so $(1/2,1/2)$ is an equilibrium payoff of the reduced stochastic game:

$$\begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{cc} L & R \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} T \\ B \end{array} & \left(\begin{array}{cc} (1,0)\circlearrowleft & (-1,-1)^* \\ (-1,-1)^* & (0,1)^* \end{array} \right) \end{array} .$$

The unique way to obtain $(1/2,1/2)$ as a feasible payoff in the reduced game is to play first (T,L) for a certain number of periods N, then (B,R) at period $N+1$. Given δ, the integer N has to satisfy $(1-\delta)\sum_{t=1}^{N}\delta^{t-1} = 1/2$, that is:

$$\delta^N = \frac{1}{2}.$$

If no such integer N exists, we obtain that $(1/2,1/2)$ is not an equilibrium payoff of the reduced game, so under (σ,τ) the state k_3 has zero probability to be reached, which implies that $x = 1/2$ and $y = 0$.

We define Δ_1 as the set of discount factors of the form $\delta = (\frac{1}{2})^{1/N}$, where N is a positive integer, and we put $\Delta_2 = [0,1)\backslash\Delta_1$. We have obtained:

Lemma 2.5. *For all δ in Δ_2, $E_\delta = E'_\delta = \{(1/2,0)\}$.*

Consider now δ in Δ_1, and N such that $\delta^N = \frac{1}{2}$. The pure strategy profiles where: T is played at stage 1, R is played at stage 2, (T,L) is played for N periods from stage 3 to stage $N+2$, and (B,R) is played at stage $N+3$, form a subgame-perfect Nash equilibrium of the δ-discounted game with payoff $(1/2,1/2)$. By mixing between T and B in k_1, it is then possible to obtain any point $(1/2,x)$, with $0 \leq x \leq 1/2$, as an equilibrium payoff. And no other point can be obtained, because in every equilibrium, the vector payoff conditional on k_3 being reached, is $(1/2,1/2)$. We have obtained:

Lemma 2.6. *For all δ in Δ_1, $E_\delta = E'_\delta = \{1/2\} \times [0,1/2]$.*

Because both Δ_1 and Δ_2 contain discount factors arbitrarily close to 1, lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 establish that neither E_δ nor E'_δ converge[14].

[14]One can also consider for any positive integer n, the set of Nash equilibrium payoffs E_n and subgame-perfect equilibrium payoffs E'_n of the n-period stochastic game, where the overall payoff is defined as the arithmetic average of the stage payoffs. Similar arguments show that in Example 2.4, we have $E_n = E'_n = \{1/2\} \times [0,1/2]$ for n even, and $E_n = E'_n = \{(1/2,0)\}$ for n odd. So E_n and E'_n also do not converge when n goes to infinity.

Consider now normal-form correlated equilibrium payoffs, i.e. Nash equilibrium payoffs of games where the players may initially receive private signals independent of the payoffs. For δ in Δ_2, the proof of Lemma 2.5 applies and the set of normal-form correlated equilibrium payoffs still is the singleton $\{(1/2, 0)\}$. So the set of normal-form correlated equilibrium payoffs can not converge when the discount factor goes to one.

Notice that an important feature of the reduced game is that there is (at most) a unique way to obtain the payoff (1/2,1/2). As soon as one perturbs the payoffs, this property will disappear, and example 2.4 is not robust to perturbations of the payoffs of the stochastic game. □

Example 2.7. The stochastic game is represented by the following matrices:

$$\begin{array}{lcc} & L & M & R \\ \text{State } k_1: \quad T & (1,1)^* & (-30,-30)^* & (-30,-30)^* \\ \qquad\quad B & (-1,-1)^{k_2} & (-30,-30)^* & (-30,-30)^* \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lcc} & L & M & R \\ \text{State } k_2: \quad T & (-1,-1)\circlearrowleft & (-12,-11)^* & (-4,-7)^* \\ \qquad\quad B & (-22,-12)^* & (3,-2)^* & (-9,-4)^* \end{array}$$

There are 2 non absorbing states: k_1 (the initial state) and k_2, and 7 absorbing states. Player 1 has 2 actions: T and B, and player 2 has 3 actions: L, M and R. Playing (B, L) in state k_1(or (T, L) in state k_2) leads to state k_2.

Consider the δ-discounted game. In any Nash equilibrium, Player 2 plays L at stage 1. There exists a Nash equilibrium where (T, L) is played at stage 1, and if $\delta \geq 1/2$ there also exists a Nash equilibrium where (B, L) is played at stage 1 and (B, M) is played at stage 2. So for $\delta \geq 1/2$, E_δ contains the payoff $(1, 1)$ as well as a payoff with second coordinate not greater than -1 for player 2. The question is now whether E_δ contains payoffs with second coordinate in $(-1, 1)$, i.e. if at equilibrium player 1 can mix between T and B at stage 1.

Lemma 2.8. *In the game with initial state k_2 and discount δ, the set of Nash (or perfect) equilibrium payoffs is:*

$$\{(1-\delta^N)(-1,-1)+\delta^N(u_1,u_2), N \in I\!N \cup \{+\infty\}, (u_1,u_2) \in \{(3,-2),(-6,-5)\}\}.$$

Proof: Let (σ, τ) be a Nash equilibrium of the stochastic game with initial state k_2. We prove that under (σ, τ), either (T, L) is played at every stage, or (T, L) is first played a certain number N of stages, then followed if N is finite by an absorbing action profile with payoff $(3, -2)$ or $(-6, -5)$.

Denote by α' the best reply payoff of player 1 against the continuation strategy induced by τ after (T, L) was played at stage 1. We have $\alpha' \in [-10, 3]$, and define $\alpha = (1-\delta)(-1) + \delta\alpha' \in [-10, 3]$. Similarly, denote by β' the best reply payoff of player 2 against the continuation strategy induced by σ after (T, L) was played at stage 1. And define $\beta = (1-\delta)(-1) + \delta\beta' \in [-13/2, -1]$. The strategies induced by (σ, τ) at stage 1 form a Nash equilibrium of the bimatrix game:

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ T \\ B \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} L & M & R \end{array} \\ \begin{pmatrix} (\alpha, \beta) & (-12, -11) & (-4, -7) \\ (-22, -12) & (3, -2) & (-9, -4) \end{pmatrix} \end{array}.$$

Let x, resp. y_1, y_2, y_3, be the probability that σ, resp. τ, plays T, resp. L, M, R at stage 1. If $y_1 y_2 > 0$, player 2 is indifferent between L and M, which implies that $x = \frac{10}{21+\beta} \in [1/2, 5/7]$. But then R is strictly better than M for player 2, hence a contradiction with $y_2 > 0$. If $y_1 y_3 > 0$, then $y_2 = 0$ and T is strictly better than B for player 1, so $x = 1$ which contradicts $y_3 > 0$. Consequently, if $y_1 > 0$ the only case is $y_1 = 1$, and $x = 1$. (σ, τ) plays (T, L) at stage 1.

If $y_1 = 0$, we have a Nash equilibrium of the game

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ T \\ B \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} M & R \end{array} \\ \begin{pmatrix} (-12, -11) & (-4, -7) \\ (3, -2) & (-9, -4) \end{pmatrix} \end{array},$$

and obtain[15] that either (B, M), or the mixed action profile $(1/3T + 2/3B, 1/4M + 3/4R)$, is played by (σ, τ) at stage 1. Notice that both (B, M) and $(1/3T + 2/3B, 1/4M + 3/4R)$ lead with probability one to absorbing states of the stochastic game.

Iterating the argument from stage 1 on, leads to the inclusion of the Nash equilibrium payoffs set into $\{(1-\delta^N)(-1,-1) + \delta^N(u_1, u_2), N \in I\!N \cup \{+\infty\}, (u_1, u_2) \in \{(3, -2), (-6, -5)\}\}$. It is then easy to see that the conclusions of Lemma 2.8 hold.

We now uniquely consider the stochastic game with initial state k_1. Define $\Delta_1 = \{\delta \in [0, 1), \exists M \geq 1, (1-\delta^M)(-1) + 3\delta^M = 1\}$, which is as in Example 2.4 the countable set of discount factors of the form $(\frac{1}{2})^{1/M}$, with M a positive integer.

Consider $\delta = (\frac{1}{2})^{1/M} \in \Delta_1$, there exists a Nash equilibrium where (B, L) is played at stage 1 having payoff $(1, u_2)$, with $u_2 \leq -1$. Considering equilibria where player 1 mixes at stage 1, we obtain for δ in Δ_1:

$$\{1\} \times [-1, 1] \subset E'_\delta.$$

[15]The profile (T, R) is ruled out by action L of player 2.

On the contrary, for $\delta \notin \Delta_1$, no Nash equilibrium of the stochastic game can mix between T and B at stage 1, so the equilibrium payoffs set satisfy:

$$E_\delta \cap \{(u_1, u_2), u_2 \in (-1, 1)\} = \emptyset.$$

This is enough to conclude that E_δ and E'_δ do not converge as δ goes to one. And one can easily check that all arguments are robust to small perturbations of the payoffs of the stochastic game. □

We want to point out that the above examples are limited in several ways. In particular:

1) Many Folk theorems in the literature require the limit set to have non-empty interior. In both examples, $E_\delta = E'_\delta$ has empty interior for each discount factor.

2) The examples are not robust to the introduction of an extensive-form correlation device. In example 2.4, if whenever k_3 is reached the players can publicly observe the outcome of a fair coin tossing, they can correlate and play there (T, L) and (B, R) with probability $1/2$. With such correlation device, it is possible to obtain $(1/2, 1/2)$ as an equilibrium payoff for all discount factors.

In example 2.7, the distance between the segment $\{1\} \times [-1, 1]$ and the set of normal-form correlated equilibrium payoffs of the δ-discounted game goes to 0 when δ goes to 1: consider a public correlation device mixing between the equilibrium with payoff $(1, 1)$ and the equilibrium with payoff $(1-\delta^N)(-1, -1) + \delta^N(3, -2)$ with N the smallest integer such that $\delta^N \geq 1/2$.

3) If the sets of equilibrium payoffs do not converge, some long-term equilibrium payoffs clearly emerge. In example 2.4, for all converging selections $(x_\delta)_\delta$ of $(E'_\delta)_\delta$, the limit payoff is $(1/2, 0)$, and for all discount δ the unique stationary equilibrium payoffs is also $(1/2, 0)$. Moreover, one can show that $E_\infty = \{(1/2, 0)\}$, i.e. the unique uniform equilibrium payoff is $(1/2, 0)$. And playing B in k_1 is somehow a risky option for player 1, since he can immediately secure $1/2$ by playing T and has almost no chance to get a better payoff by playing B. So even if the sets of equilibrium payoffs do not converge, the payoff $(1/2, 0)$ clearly emerges, and we believe it can be considered as the reasonable limit outcome of the stochastic game. If an expert is asked "The game being played by extremely patient players, which outcome is likely to form ?", we would recommend the answer to be $(1/2, 0)$.

In example 2.7, the limits of converging selections $(x_\delta)_\delta$ of $(E'_\delta)_\delta$ are the elements of the set E_∞ of uniform equilibrium payoffs of the stochastic game, which is the union of the singleton $\{(1, 1)\}$ and of the line segment joining $(1, -3/2)$ to $(3, -2)$. The limit set of stationary equilibrium payoffs E defined by proposition 2.1 is the pair $\{(1, 1), (3, -2)\}$. $(1, 1)$ is achieved by an equilibrium where player 2 plays L in every period, and $(3, -2)$ is achieved by an equilibrium where player 1 first plays T, then B in each period. When the game is played by very patient players, we believe that one of these two payoff vectors is likely to occur.

The counterexample of the next section will not have these limiting properties and will be very robust in many aspects.

3 Hidden Stochastic Games

We enlarge the model of stochastic games by assuming that at the beginning of every period, the players observe a public signal on the current state. We still denote by K, I and J respectively the finite sets of states, actions for player 1 and actions for player 2, and we introduce a finite set S of public signals. As in the previous section, u_1 and u_2 are the state dependent utility functions from $K \times I \times J \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, but now the transition function q goes from $K \times I \times J$ to $\Delta(K \times S)$, the set of probabilities over $K \times S$, and there is an initial distribution π in $\Delta(K \times S)$. The elements K, I, J, S, u_1, u_2, q and π are known to the players.

At the first period, a couple (k_1, s_1) is selected according to π, and the players publicly observe s_1, but not k_1. The players simultaneously select actions $i_1 \in I$ and $j_1 \in J$, then these actions are publicly observed, the stage payoffs are $u_1(k_1, i_1, j_1)$ for player 1 and $u_2(k_1, i_1, j_1)$ for player 2, and the play goes to period 2. At every period $t \geq 2$, a couple (k_t, s_t) is selected according to $q(k_{t-1}, i_{t-1}, j_{t-1})$, k_t is the state of period t but the players only observe the public signal s_t. Then they simultaneously select actions $i_t \in I$ and $j_t \in J$. These actions are publicly observed, the stage payoffs are $u_1(k_t, i_t, j_t)$ for player 1 and $u_2(k_t, i_t, j_t)$ for player 2, and the play goes to the period $t + 1$. Given a discount factor δ in $[0, 1)$, the δ-discounted hidden stochastic game is the game with payoff functions $(1 - \delta) \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^{t-1} u_1(k_t, i_t, j_t)$ and $(1 - \delta) \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \delta^{t-1} u_2(k_t, i_t, j_t)$. We respectively denote by E_δ and E'_δ the sets of Nash equilibrium payoffs and sequential equilibrium payoffs of this game.

This is a generalization of the model of stochastic game presented in section 2, where one has $S = K$ and $s_t = k_t$ for all t. In the model of hidden stochastic game (HSG, for short), the players have incomplete information on the current state, but this information is common to both players, and can be represented by a belief p_t on the state k_t. Given the initial signal s_1, the initial belief p_1 is the conditional probability induced by π on K given s_1. The belief p_t is a random variable which can be computed[16] recursively from p_{t-1} by Bayes' rule after observing the public signal s_t and the past actions i_{t-1} and j_{t-1}. We can thus associate to our HSG, an equivalent stochastic game where the state variable p lies in $\Delta(K)$ and represents the common belief on the current state in the HSG, and where now actions and state variables are publicly observed, in addition to the public[17] signal s. A strategy in the HSG uniquely defines an equivalent strategy

[16]Notice that this belief does not depend on the *strategy* of the players, as in repeated games with incomplete information, but only on past actions played and public signals observed.

[17]In the equivalent stochastic game, the public signal s gives no extra information on past

in the stochastic game, and vice-versa. And in particular the sets of equilibrium payoffs of the two games coincide. By definition, a stationary strategy in the associated stochastic game plays after every history a mixed action which only depends on the current state variable in $\Delta(K)$. And we will say that a strategy σ in the HSG is stationary if the associated strategy in the stochastic game is stationary, that is if σ plays after every history a mixed action which only depends on the current belief in $\Delta(K)$.

Standard fixed-point (contraction) arguments show that E_δ and E'_δ are non-empty, and there exists a stationary equilibrium in the δ-discounted associated stochastic game. We will also briefly consider the set of uniform equilibrium payoffs E_∞, defined as in the previous section.

When there is a single player (for instance, when player 2 has a unique action), a hidden stochastic game is simply a partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP), and if moreover player 1 plays constantly the same mixed action, we obtain a Hidden Markov model, which can be considered as the simplest model of dynamic Bayesian network. Hidden stochastic games generalize both standard stochastic games and POMDP. An interesting subclass of hidden stochastic games is the following class of HSG with known payoffs, where the public signals are rich enough for the players to know after every history what is the current payoff function. We write $q(k,i,j)(k',s)$ the probability in $[0,1]$ that the couple (k',s) is chosen when the probability $q(k,i,j)$ is used.

Definition 3.1. The hidden stochastic game has *known payoffs* if the set of states K can be partitioned[18] in a way such that for all states k, k', k_1, k_2, actions i, i' in I, j, j' in J, and signal s in S:

1)if $k_1 \sim k_2$ then $u_1(k_1,i,j) = u_1(k_2,i,j)$ and $u_2(k_1,i,j) = u_2(k_2,i,j)$ (two states in the same element of the partition induce the same payoff function), and

2) if $q(k,i,j)(k_1,s) > 0$ and $q(k',i',j')(k_2,s) > 0$ then $k_1 \sim k_2$ (observing the public signal is enough to deduce the element of the partition containing the current state).

In a hidden stochastic game with known payoffs, the players know after every history the cell of the partition containing the current state, so when players choose their actions they know the current payoff function, as it happens in a standard stochastic game . However they may not exactly know the current state in K, so they are uncertain about the transition probabilities to the next state, and to the cell containing this state. In a standard stochastic game, one can define: $k \sim k'$ if and only if $k = k'$, and the conditions of definition 3.1 are satisfied. Hence HSG with known payoffs generalize stochastic games, and this generalization is meaningful in several cases.

---

actions or on the state variable. Its unique influence is that it may be used by the players as a correlation device. Notice that the equivalent stochastic game is not a standard stochastic game as described in section 2.

[18]We write $k_1 \sim k_2$ whenever k_1 and k_2 are in the same equivalence class, or cell, of the partition.

Example 3.2. The players are firms competing a la Cournot on a market for a natural exhaustible resource. Only two firms are present on this market, and in each period, each firm decides how much resource to extract (to produce). Then a price is set in order to equalize offer and demand, and all the production is sold at this price. Action sets are $I = \{0, ..., M_1\}$ and $J = \{0, ..., M_2\}$ where M_f is the maximal possible production (e.g., in tonnes) of firm f. The state variable k is the amount of natural resources remaining (the stock), and the firms have incomplete information on remaining stocks. They have a common belief on the initial stock value k_1, and there is a cap M such that in each period, if the current stock k is greater than M the firms just know that there are at least M remaining resources, whereas if k is at most M the firms precisely know k. Transitions are deterministic : if in some state k, actions i and j such that $i + j \leq k$ are played, then it is possible for the firms to actually produce the quantities x and y, and the next state is[19] $k - (i + j)$. If $k > i + j$, the next state is 0 and the game is essentially over. Payoffs are function of the actions, and possibly of the current state as well (when the state is lower than the sum of productions, or when the state does not exceed M and the demand anticipates the scarcity of the resource).

Example 3.3. Consider an oligopoly with two firms on a market for a single good. In each period (e.g., a year) a firm chooses its selling price, as well as development and advertising budgets. The state variable k represents the state of the market, which includes, but is not limited to, the current demand function for each firm, which is a function of the current price profile. The state also contains additional information about fundamentals which will influence the future evolution of the demand, such as the trend of the market, the development of close goods by other firms or the overall state of the economy. In each period revenues are determined by the current demand function and the current prices chosen, and stage payoffs are the revenues minus development and advertising budgets. Transitions of the state variable depend on the state variable and the actions chosen, and firms are able to observe at the beginning of every period, at least the current demand function but possibly not all characteristics of the state.

Regarding limit equilibrium payoffs in hidden stochastic games, we know by proposition 2.3 that there is no hope to obtain convergence of the sequences $(E_\delta)_\delta$ or $(E'_\delta)_\delta$. The following result shows that the situation is even more dramatic in our context of hidden stochastic games.

Theorem 3.4. *For each ε in $(0, \frac{5}{12}]$ and r in $(0, \varepsilon/5)$, there exists a 2-player Hidden Stochastic Game Γ having the following properties:*

1. *There are 13 states and public signals, four actions for each player, and all payoffs lie in $[0, 1]$,*
2. *The game is symmetric between the players, and has known payoffs,*

[19] A more general variant for partially renewable resources would read: the next state is$(1 + r)(k - (i + j))$, where r is the renewal rate.

3. *For all initial distributions and discount factors, the corresponding set of sequential equilibrium payoffs contains a square of side $2r$, hence has full dimension,*

4. *There is an initial state k_1, perfectly known to the players, and there exist two subsets Δ_1 and Δ_2 of $[0,1)$, both containing discount factors arbitrarily close to 1, such that:*

   for all δ in Δ_1, the set of sequential equilibrium payoffs E'_δ is the square E_1 centered in (ϵ,ϵ) with side $2r$, whereas for all δ in Δ_2, the set of sequential equilibrium payoffs E'_δ is the square E_2 centered in $(1-\epsilon,1-\epsilon)$ with side $2r$.

   Moreover for δ in $\Delta_1 \cup \Delta_2$, the associated square is also the set of Nash equilibrium payoffs, the set of correlated equilibrium payoffs, and the set of communication equilibrium payoffs of the δ-discounted game, as well as the set of stationary equilibrium payoffs of the associated stochastic game with state variable the belief on the states of the original game.
   There is no converging selection of $(E_\delta)_\delta$, and Γ has no uniform equilibrium payoff.

5. *The above conclusions are robust to perturbations of the payoffs. Consider, for $\eta \in [0, \frac{r(\varepsilon-5r)}{2})$, a perturbed game $\Gamma(\eta)$ obtained by perturbing each payoff of Γ by at most η. The initial state being k_1, denote by $E_\delta(\eta)$ the corresponding set of δ-discounted Nash equilibrium payoffs. We have:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall \delta \in \Delta_1, \qquad E_\delta(\eta) \subset [\varepsilon - r - \eta, \varepsilon + r + \eta]^2, \\ &\forall \delta \in \Delta_2, \quad E_\delta(\eta) \subset [1 - \varepsilon - r - \eta, 1 - \varepsilon + r + \eta]^2. \end{aligned}$$

   There is no converging selection of $(E_\delta(\eta))_\delta$, and $\Gamma(\eta)$ has no uniform equilibrium payoff. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\eta\to 0} \lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_1} E'_\delta(\eta) = E_1 \quad &\text{and} \quad \lim_{\eta\to 0} \lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_2} E'_\delta(\eta) = E_2, \\ \lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_1} \limsup_{\eta\to 0} d(E_\delta(\eta), E_1) = 0 \quad &\text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_2} \limsup_{\eta\to 0} d(E_\delta(\eta), E_2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$



The rest of the paper is devoted to the construction of the example of theorem 3.4. We progressively introduce more and more ingredients in the construction, starting with a Markov chain on $[0,1]$, then a Markov Decision Process, then a zero-sum stochastic game with infinite state space, a zero-sum HSG and finally our example[20].

4 Proof of Theorem 3.4

4.1 A Markov chain on [0,1]

Given a parameter $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we consider the following Markov chain with state variable q in $[0,1]$ and initial state $q_0 = 1$. Time is discrete, and if q_t is the state

[20]Apart the presentation, the main differences with the 2013 example of Ziliotto are the following. Due to the zero-sum aspect in the 2013 example the game was non symmetric and equilibrium payoff sets had empty interior, this is taken care in the last construction of section 4. In the non zero-sum case here the associated stochastic game with state variable in $\Delta(K)$ is not necessarily Nash-payoff equivalent to the HSG since public signals may be used in the HSG as correlation devices. A main difference is that we need here equilibrium payoffs to go not only from 1/2 to 5/9, but from arbitrarily close to 0 to arbitrarily close to 1, so we improve the construction by studying Markov chains and MDP with general parameters α and β (which were equal to 1/2 for both players in the 2013 example). The asymmetry between players was obtained in 2013 by introducing a different structure for the MDP of player 2, whereas here the consideration of different parameters allows to stick to a symmetric, hence somehow simpler, construction. We also consider non zero-sum perturbations of the payoffs, and have to deal with multiplicity of equilibria. Finally we also consider multiple solution concepts: Nash, sequential, correlated and communication equilibria.

of period t then with probability α the next state q_{t+1} is $\alpha\, q_t$ and with probability $1-\alpha$ the next state q_{t+1} is 1.



Because of the transitions, the set of states that can be reached is the countable set $\{\alpha^a, a \in I\!N\}$. This Markov chain can be viewed as follows: there is an infinite sequence X_1, ..., X_t, ... of i.i.d. Bernouilli random variables with success parameter α, we add an initial constant variable $X_0 = 0$, and at any period t the state of the Markov chain is α^a if and only if the last a (but not $a+1$) realizations of the Bernouilli variables have been successful, i.e. iff $X_{t-a} = 0$ and $X_{t'} = 1$ for $t - a + 1 \leq t' \leq t$.

In the next subsection, the variable q will be interpreted as a *risk* variable with the following interpretation. Suppose a decision-maker observes the realizations of the Markov chain, and has to decide as a function of q when he will take a risky action, having probability of success $1-q$ and probability of failure q. He would like q to be as small as possible, but time is costly and there is a discount factor δ. For a in $I\!N$, we denote by T_a the stopping time of the first period where the risk is α^a, i.e.

$$T_a = \inf\{t \geq 1, q_t \leq \alpha^a\}.$$

If $a = 0$, then $T_a = 1$ and $\delta^{T_a} = \delta$. If $a \geq 1$, then T_a is a random variable which law can be easily computed by induction. Indeed, we have:

$$T_a \;\; = \;\; T_{a-1} + 1 + \mathbf{1}_{X_{T_a}=0}\, T'_a,$$

where T'_a has the same law as T_a and is independent from X_{T_a-1}. As a consequence,

$$I\!E(T_a) = \frac{1}{\alpha}(1 + I\!E(T_{a-1})).$$

$I\!E(T_a)$ grows exponentially with a, and this is an important feature of our counterexample: while slightly decreasing the risk α^a in the bounded set $(0, 1]$, the

number of stages one may have to wait before reaching the new risk level greatly increases.

The expectation of δ^{T_a} will play an important role in the sequel and can be easily computed as well (see e.g. lemma 2.2 and proposition 2.6 in [12]).

Lemma 4.1.

$$\mathbb{E}(\delta^{T_a}) = \frac{1-\alpha\delta}{1-\alpha+(1-\delta)\alpha^{-a}\delta^{-a-1}}.$$

4.2 A Markov Decision Process on [0,1]

We introduce a player who observes the realizations of the above Markov chain and can choose as a function of the state q when he will take a risky action, having probability of success $1-q$ and probability of failure q. In case of success, the payoff of the player will be R at all subsequent stages, where R is a fixed positive reward. The payoff is 0 at any stage before taking the risky action, and at any stage after the risky action has been taken unsuccessfully. Overall payoffs are discounted with discount δ.



In this MDP with finite actions set, there exists a pure stationary optimal strategy. Notice that a pure stationary strategy of the player can be represented by a non negative integer a, corresponding to the risk threshold α^a. We define the a-strategy of the player as the strategy where he takes the risky action as soon as the state variable of the Markov chain does not exceed α^a. The expected discounted payoff induced is

$$\mathbb{E}\left((1-\delta^{T_a})0 + \delta^{T_a}(\alpha^a 0 + (1-\alpha^a)R)\right) = R\,(1-\alpha^a)\,\mathbb{E}(\delta^{T_a}).$$

Hence using lemma 4.1, we obtain:

Lemma 4.2. *The payoff of the a-strategy in the MDP with parameter α and discount δ is:*

$$\frac{(1-\alpha^a)(1-\alpha\delta)R}{1-\alpha+(1-\delta)\alpha^{-a}\delta^{-a-1}}.$$

This payoff is proportional to $R > 0$, hence the optimal strategies do not depend on the value of R. Intuitively this is clear, counting the reward in Dollars or Euros does not affect the strategic problem of the decision-maker. This problem is now to choose a non negative integer a maximizing the above payoff function.

Definition 4.3. *Define, for all a in $\mathbb{R}_+$,*

$$s_{\alpha,\delta}(a) = (1-\alpha^a)\mathbb{E}(\delta^{T_a}) = \frac{(1-\alpha^a)(1-\alpha\delta)}{1-\alpha+(1-\delta)\alpha^{-a}\delta^{-a-1}},$$

and let $v_{\alpha,\delta} = \max_{a\in\mathbb{N}} s_{\alpha,\delta}(a)$ denote the value of the δ-discounted MDP with parameter α and reward $R = 1$.

$v_{\alpha,\delta} = \max_{a\in\mathbb{N}} s_{\alpha,\delta}(a)$ is clear[21] since there exists a pure optimal stationary strategy in the δ-discounted MDP. The parameter α being fixed, we are now interested in maximizing $s_{\alpha,\delta}$ for δ close to 1. Differentiating the function $(a \mapsto \frac{(1-\alpha^a)}{1-\alpha+(1-\delta)\alpha^{-a}})$ and proceeding by asymptotical equivalence when δ goes to 1, naturally leads to the introduction of the following quantity.

Definition 4.4. *When $\delta \in [\alpha, 1)$, we define $a^* = a^*(\alpha,\delta)$ in $\mathbb{R}_+$ such that:*

$$\alpha^{a^*} = \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}.$$

Let $\Delta_1(\alpha) = \{1-(1-\alpha)\alpha^{2a}, a \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be the set of discount factors δ such that $a^*(\alpha,\delta)$ is an integer, and let $\Delta_2(\alpha) = \{1-(1-\alpha)\alpha^{2a+\eta}, a \in \mathbb{N}, \eta \in [-3/2, 3/2]\}$ be the set of discount factors δ such that $a^*(\alpha,\delta) \in \mathbb{N} + [1/4, 3/4]$.

$\Delta_1(\alpha)$ and $\Delta_2(\alpha)$ contain discount factors arbitrarily close to 1. a^* can be expressed in closed form as $a^* = \frac{\ln(1-\delta)-\ln(1-\alpha)}{2\ln\alpha}$. Since $\delta^{\ln(1-\delta)}$ converges to 1 when δ goes to 1, we obtain: $\delta^{a^*} \xrightarrow[\delta\to 1]{} 1$.

Proposition 4.5.

1) $v_{\alpha,\delta} \xrightarrow[\delta\to 1]{} 1$.

2) For $\alpha < 1/4$ and $\delta \in \Delta_1(\alpha)$, the $a^*(\alpha,\delta)$-strategy is optimal in the MDP and

$$\lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_1(\alpha)} \frac{1-v_{\alpha,\delta}}{\sqrt{1-\delta}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{1-\alpha}}.$$

3) For all α,

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_2(\alpha)} \frac{1-v_{\alpha,\delta}}{\sqrt{1-\delta}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}}.$$

[21] One can verify analytically that the maximum of $s_{\alpha,\delta}$ over $\mathbb{N}$ is achieved, since $0 = s_{\alpha,\delta}(0) = \lim_{+\infty} s_{\alpha,\delta}$.

The convergence property in 1) is very intuitive: when δ is high, the decision-maker can wait for the state variable to be very low, so that she takes the risky action with high probability of success. Points 2) (when $\alpha < 1/4$) and 3) give asymptotic expansions for the value $v_{\alpha,\delta}$ when δ goes to 1, respectively of the form $v_{\alpha,\delta} = 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon_\alpha(\delta)$ and $v_{\alpha,\delta} \leq 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}} + \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon'_\alpha(\delta)$, where ε_α and ε'_α are functions with limit 0 when δ goes to 1. Later on, the parameter α will be small, and the situation of the associated player will be much better when δ is close to 1 in $\Delta_1(\alpha)$ compared to when δ is close to 1 in $\Delta_2(\alpha)$. The proof of proposition 4.5 is based on simple computations that are presented in the Appendix.

4.3 A zero-sum stochastic game with perfect information

We fix here two parameters α and β in $(0,1)$, and define a 2-player zero-sum stochastic game $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$ with infinite state space:

$$X = \{(1,q), q \in [0,1]\} \cup \{(2,l), l \in [0,1]\} \cup 0^* \cup 1^*.$$



Figure 1: The stochastic game $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$

The initial state is $(2,1)$. The sum of the payoffs of the players is constant[22] equal to 1. States 0^* and 1^* are absorbing states with, respectively, payoffs 0 and 1 to player 1. The payoffs only depend on the states, and the payoff of player 1 is 0 in a state of the form $(1,q)$, and 1 in a state of the form $(2,l)$. Each player has 2 actions: Wait or Jump. Transitions in a state $(1,q)$ are controlled by player 1 only: if player 1 Waits in state $(1,q)$, then the next state is $(1,\alpha q)$ with probability α and $(1,1)$ with probability $1-\alpha$, as in the MDP of subsection 4.2, and if player 1 Jumps in state $(1,q)$, then the next state is 0^* with probability q and $(2,1)$ with probability $1-q$. Similarly, transitions in a state $(2,l)$ are controlled by player 2 only: if player 2 Waits in state $(2,l)$, then the next state is $(2,\beta l)$ with probability β and $(2,1)$ with probability $1-\beta$, and if player 2 Jumps in state $(2,l)$, then the next state is 1^* with probability l and $(1,1)$ with probability $1-l$. Payoffs are discounted with discount factor $\delta \in [0,1)$, and the value of the stochastic game is denoted $v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}$.

The strategic aspects of this game have strong similarities with those of the previous MDP. Consider for instance Player 1, his payoff is 0 in 0^* and all states $(1,q)$, and his payoff is 1 in 1^* and the states $(2,l)$. Starting from state (1,1), the only possibility for Player 1 to obtain positive payoffs is to Jump at some period to try to reach the state $(2,1)$. He can wait for the state to be $(1,q)$ with q small, so that the risk of reaching the state 0^* while jumping is low, but each period in a state $(1,q)$ gives him a null payoff so he should not wait too long. The situation is symmetric for player 2, apart from the fact that the initial state is $(2,1)$, hence controlled by him.

Since the game is discounted and states are controlled by a single player, it is natural to look at pure stationary[23] strategies of the players.

Definition 4.6. *For a in $\mathbb{N}$, the a-strategy of Player 1 is the strategy where Player 1 Jumps in a state $(1,q)$ if and only if $q \leq \alpha^a$. Similarly, for b in $\mathbb{N}$ the b-strategy of Player 2 is the strategy where Player 2 Jumps in a state $(2,l)$ if and only if $l \leq \beta^b$. And we denote by $g_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b)$ the payoff of Player 1 in the stochastic game where Player 1 uses the a-strategy and Player 2 uses the b-strategy.*

Assume that Player 2 uses a b-strategy. Then Player 1 faces a MDP with finite action sets, hence he/she has a pure stationary best reply, that is Player 1 has a best reply in the stochastic game in the form of a a-strategy. Similarly, if Player 1 uses a a-strategy, Player 2 has a best reply in the stochastic game in the form of a b-strategy. It is then natural to consider the game restricted to a- and b-strategies.

[22] so strictly speaking, the game is constant-sum and not zero-sum, but we make the usual language abuse.

[23] Notice that a and b-strategies are not fully defined in definition 4.6, since they do not specify the actions played in the absorbing states nor in the states controlled by the other player. Since these actions have no impact on the game, we will simply ignore them.

Lemma 4.7. *For a and b in $\mathbb{N}$,*

$$g_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b) = \frac{1 - s_{\beta,\delta}(b)}{1 - s_{\alpha,\delta}(a)s_{\beta,\delta}(b)}.$$

Proof: Recall that $s_{\alpha,\delta}(a) = (1-\alpha^a)\mathbb{E}_\alpha(\delta^{T_a})$, where T_a is the random variable defined in subsection 4.1 and $\mathbb{E}_\alpha$ denotes the expectation for the Markov chain with parameter α. Similarly, one has $s_{\beta,\delta}(b) = (1-\beta^b)\mathbb{E}_\beta(\delta^{T_b})$.

Starting from the initial state, with probability β^b the first Jump of player 2 will end up in 1^* and the payoff for player 1 will be 1 in each period, and with probability $1-\beta^b$ the game will first stay T_b stages in a state controlled by player 2 and then reach the state $(1,1)$. This gives:

$$g_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b) = \beta^b + (1-\beta^b)\mathbb{E}_\beta\left((1-\delta^{T_b}) + \delta^{T_b} g'_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b)\right),$$

where $g'_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b)$ denotes the payoff of the a-strategy against the b-strategy in the game with initial state $(1,1)$. So $g_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b) = 1 + s_{\beta,\delta}(b)(-1 + g'_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b))$. Similarly,

$$g'_{,\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b) = \alpha^a 0 + (1-\alpha^a)\mathbb{E}_\alpha(\delta^{T_a}) g_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b),$$

so $g'_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b) = s_{\alpha,\delta}(a) g_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}(a,b)$. Hence the result of lemma 4.7.

Let us come back to the consideration that Player 2 plays a b-strategy, and denote by R the best payoff that Player 1 can obtain against this strategy from the state $(1,1)$ (if the play never reaches this state, then player 1 has nothing to do and gets a payoff of 1 in each period). We have seen that Player 1 has a best reply in the form of a a-strategy, and finding the best a is equivalent to finding a pure optimal strategy in the MDP of subsection 4.2 with reward R. But we have seen in subsection 4.2 that this optimal value for a does not depend on R, and simply maximizes $s_{\alpha,\delta}(a)$. This implies that the best reply of player 1 does not depend on b, and the corresponding a-strategy is a *dominant* strategy of player 1 in the zero-sum stochastic game restricted to pure stationary strategies. The existence of dominant strategies in a zero-sum game is rather rare, and this is an important property of the present example. It can be verified analytically by looking at the function $g_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}$: for all b, it is increasing in $s_{\alpha,\delta}(a)$, and for all a, it is decreasing in $s_{\beta,\delta}(b)$. This proves 1) in the proposition below.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $a^\#$ and $b^\#$ be respectively maximizers of $s_{\alpha,\delta}(a)$ for a in $\mathbb{N}$, and of $s_{\beta,\delta}(b)$ for b in $\mathbb{N}$, i.e. be non negative integers such that $s_{\alpha,\delta}(a^\#) = v_{\alpha,\delta}$ and $s_{\beta,\delta}(b^\#) = v_{\beta,\delta}$.*

1) The $a^\#$-strategy, resp. the $b^\#$-strategy, is a dominant strategy for player 1, resp. player 2, in the zero-sum stochastic game restricted to pure stationary strategies.

2) The $a^\#$-strategy, resp. the $b^\#$-strategy, is an optimal strategy for player 1, resp. player 2, in the zero-sum stochastic game $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$.

3) The value of $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfies:

$$v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} = \frac{1 - v_{\beta,\delta}}{1 - v_{\alpha,\delta} v_{\beta,\delta}}.$$

Proof: 2) The strategy profile induced by $(a^{\#}, b^{\#})$ is a Nash equilibrium of the game $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$ restricted to pure stationary strategies. Since against a pure stationary strategy each player has a pure stationary best reply, this strategy profile is indeed a Nash equilibrium of the game $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$. Hence the value of $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$ is the payoff induced by this strategy profile, and 3) follows.

Notice that $v_{\alpha,\alpha,\delta} = \frac{1}{1+v_{\alpha,\delta}} \underset{\delta\to 1}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1}{2}$. We are interested in cases where $\alpha \neq \beta$, and the next proposition is a building brick for our global construction.

Proposition 4.9. *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, and $\alpha := 1/n$ and $\beta := 1/(n+1)$, we have:*

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 1} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} \geq 1 - \varepsilon, \text{ and } \liminf_{\delta\to 1} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof: We proceed in 2 steps.

Step 1: Define $\Delta_1(\alpha,\beta) := \Delta_1(\alpha) \cap \Delta_2(\beta)$, that is:

$$\Delta_1(\alpha,\beta) = \{\delta \in [0,1), \exists (a,b,\eta) \in I\!N^2 \times [-3/2, 3/2], \delta = 1-(1-\alpha)\alpha^{2a} = 1-(1-\beta)\beta^{2b+\eta}\}.$$

Discount factors in $\Delta_1(\alpha,\beta)$ simultaneously favor player 1 and disfavor player 2 in their respective MDP: for $\delta \in \Delta_1(\alpha,\beta)$, we have by proposition 4.5 that $v_{\alpha,\delta} = 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon_\alpha(\delta)$ and $v_{\beta,\delta} \leq 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\beta^{1/2}(1-\beta)}} + \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon'_\beta(\delta)$, with $\lim_{\delta\to 1} \varepsilon_\alpha = \lim_{\delta\to 1} \varepsilon'_\beta = 0$. Since $v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} = \frac{1-v_{\beta,\delta}}{1-v_{\alpha,\delta}v_{\beta,\delta}}$ is decreasing in $v_{\beta,\delta}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} &\geq \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\beta^{1/2}(1-\beta)}} - \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon'_\beta(\delta)}{1 - \left(1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon_\alpha(\delta)\right)\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\beta^{1/2}(1-\beta)}} + \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon'_\beta(\delta)\right)}, \\ &\geq \frac{\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\beta^{1/2}(1-\beta)}} - \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon'_\beta(\delta)}{\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\beta^{1/2}(1-\beta)}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + \sqrt{1-\delta}\,\varepsilon''(\delta)}, \text{ where } \lim_{\delta\to 1} \varepsilon'' = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies, if $\Delta_1(\alpha,\beta)$ contains discount factors arbitrarily close to 1:

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_1(\alpha,\beta)} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} \geq \frac{1}{1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{\beta^{1/2}(1-\beta)}{1-\alpha}}}. \tag{1}$$

In the same vein, we define $\Delta_2(\alpha,\beta) := \Delta_2(\alpha) \cap \Delta_1(\beta)$, that is:

$$\Delta_2(\alpha,\beta) = \{\delta \in [0,1), \exists (a,b,\eta) \in I\!N^2 \times [-3/2, 3/2], \delta = 1-(1-\alpha)\alpha^{2a+\eta} = 1-(1-\beta)\beta^{2b}\}.$$

Discount factors in $\Delta_2(\alpha,\beta)$ simultaneously disfavor player 1 and favor player 2 in their respective MDP, and similar computations as above show that if $\Delta_2(\alpha,\beta)$ contains discount factors arbitrarily close to 1,

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 1,\delta\in\Delta_2(\alpha,\beta)} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} \leq \frac{1}{1+\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{(1-\beta)}{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}}}. \tag{2}$$

Our goal, inspired by (1) and (2), is now to prove that there exists α and β arbitrarily small such that both $\Delta_1(\alpha,\beta)$ and $\Delta_2(\alpha,\beta)$ contain discount factors arbitrarily close to 1.

Step 2:

We want to prove that for n big enough, there exists an infinite number of pairs $(a,b,\eta)\in\mathbb{N}^2\times[-3/2,3/2]$ verifying

$$1-(1-\alpha)\alpha^{2a} = 1-(1-\beta)\beta^{2b+\eta},$$

that is,

$$\ln(\beta)^{-1}\left[\ln((1-\alpha)/(1-\beta)) + 2a\ln(\alpha)\right] = 2b+\eta.$$

Let $A(\alpha,\beta) := \ln(\beta)^{-1}\ln((1-\alpha)/(1-\beta))$ and $B(\alpha,\beta) := \ln(\beta)^{-1}\ln(\alpha) - 1$. The last equation can be written as

$$A(\alpha,\beta) + 2B(\alpha,\beta)a = 2(b-a)+\eta.$$

If $B(\alpha,\beta) < 1/4$, then this equation has an infinite number of solutions $(a,b,\eta)\in\mathbb{N}^2\times[-3/2,3/2]$. Set $\alpha_n := 1/n$ and $\beta_n := 1/(n+1)$. For n big enough, we have $B(\alpha_n,\beta_n) < 1/4$. This implies that $\Delta_1(\alpha_n,\beta_n)$ contains discount factors arbitrarily close to 1, and the proof is similar for $\Delta_2(\alpha_n,\beta_n)$.
Let ϵ and $n_0\in\mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n\geq n_0$, both $\Delta_1(\alpha_n,\beta_n)$ and $\Delta_2(\alpha_n,\beta_n)$ contain discount factors arbitrarily close to 1, and $\left(1+2\sqrt{\frac{\beta_n^{1/2}(1-\beta_n)}{1-\alpha_n}}\right)^{-1} \geq 1-\epsilon$, and $\left(1+\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{(1-\beta_n)}{\alpha_n^{1/2}(1-\alpha_n)}}\right)^{-1} \leq \epsilon$. For $n\geq n_0$, equations (1) and (2) yield

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 1} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} \geq 1-\epsilon, \text{ and } \liminf_{\delta\to 1} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} \leq \epsilon,$$

and the proof of proposition 4.9 is complete.

4.4 A zero-sum hidden stochastic game

The MDP and games considered so far have perfect information and infinite state space. We now mimic the previous construction with a hidden stochastic game with 6 states and 6 public signals.

α and β being parameters in $(0,1)$, the HSG $\Gamma^*(\alpha,\beta)$ is defined as follows. The set of states is $K = \{(1,1),(1,0),(2,1),(2,0),1^*,0^*\}$, and the set of public signals is $S = \{s_1, s_1', s_1^*, s_2, s_2', s_0^*\}$. The players perfectly observe past actions and public signals, but not current states. As in the previous stochastic game, the sum of the payoffs of the players is constantly 1, and the states 0^* and 1^* are absorbing. The payoffs only depend on the states, player 1 has payoff 0 in states 0^*, $(1,0)$ and $(1,1)$, and payoff 1 in states 1^*, $(2,0)$ and $(2,1)$. Each player has 2 actions corresponding to Wait and Jump, action sets are $I = \{W_1, J_1\}$ and $J = \{W_2, J_2\}$. The initial probability π selects with probability 1 the state $(2,1)$ and the signal s_2, so the players know that at period 1 the game is in state $(2,1)$. Once in the absorbing state 0^*, resp. 1^*, the play stays there forever and the public signal is s_0^*, resp. s_1^*. Transitions from states $(1,0)$ and $(1,1)$ only depend on the action of player 1, whereas transitions from $(2,0)$ and $(2,1)$ only depend on the action of player 2, and when we write transitions we will omit the action of the player without influence. More precisely:

> If player 1 Jumps in state $(1,1)$, the play goes to the absorbing state 0^* and the public signal is s_0^*, i.e. $q((1,1),J_1)$ selects $(0^*, s_0^*)$ a.s.
>
> If player 1 Jumps in state $(1,0)$, the play goes to state $(2,1)$ and the public signal is s_2, i.e. $q((1,0),J_1)$ selects $((2,1),s_2)$ a.s.
>
> Transition when player 1 Waits in state $(1,1)$: $q((1,1),W_1)$ selects $((1,1),s_1)$ with probability $1-\alpha$, $((1,1),s_1')$ with probability α^2 and $((1,0),s_1')$ with probability $\alpha(1-\alpha)$.
>
> Transition when player 1 Waits in state $(1,0)$: $q((1,0),W_1)$ selects $((1,1),s_1)$ with probability $1-\alpha$, and $((1,0),s_1')$ with probability α.

Transitions from the states controlled by player 2 are defined symmetrically: $q((2,1),J_2)$ selects $(1^*,s_1^*)$ a.s., $q((2,0),J_2)$ selects $((1,1),s_1)$ a.s., $q((2,1),W_2)$ selects $((2,1),s_2)$ with probability $1-\beta$, $((2,1),s_2')$ with probability β^2 and $((2,0),s_2')$ with probability $\beta(1-\beta)$, and finally $q((2,0),W_2)$ selects $((2,1),s_2)$ with probability $1-\beta$ and $((2,0),s_2')$ with probability β.

Payoffs are discounted with discount factor $\delta \in [0,1)$.



Figure 2: Transitions in $\Gamma^*_{\alpha,\beta}$

Signals in states $(1,0)$ and $(1,1)$ are either s_1 or s_1', and signals in states $(2,0)$ and $(2,1)$ are either s_2 or s_2'. So the public signal always informs the players the element of the partition $\{\{(1,0),(1,1)\},\{2,0),(2,1)\},\{0^*\},\{1^*\}\}$ that contains the current state, and the game has known payoffs.

In $\Gamma^*(\alpha,\beta)$, player 1 would like to Jump in state $(1,0)$, and to Wait in state $(1,1)$ but the current state is not fully known to the players. Because of the previous partition, the belief of the players over the current state has at most 2 points in its support. Suppose this belief corresponds to the state being $(1,1)$ with probability q and $(1,0)$ with probability $1-q$. The current payoff will be 0, and the transition only depends on player 1's action:

> If player 1 Jumps, the new state is 0^* with probability q and $(2,1)$ with probability $1-q$.
>
> If player 1 Waits: with probability $1-\alpha$ the public signal will be s_1 and by Bayes' rule the players can deduce that the new state is almost surely $(1,1)$. With probability α the public signal is s_1', the probability

that the transition selects $((1,1), s'_1)$ is $q\alpha^2$ so by Bayes' rule the belief of the players over the new state is : $(1,1)$ with probability $q\alpha$ and $(1,0)$ with probability $1 - q\alpha$.

Consequently the transitions and the payoffs here perfectly mimic those of the stochastic game of subsection 4.3. The equivalent stochastic game associated to the HSG $\Gamma^*(\alpha,\beta)$ (see the beginning of section 3) corresponds to the game $\Gamma(\alpha,\beta)$, up to the addition of the observation of the public signal at the beginning of each period. This addition plays no role on the payoffs and could only be used as a correlation device for the players, but in a zero-sum context this has no influence on the value. We obtain:

Proposition 4.10. *The value of the δ-discounted hidden stochastic game $\Gamma^*(\alpha,\beta)$ is the value $v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}$ of the δ-discounted stochastic game $\Gamma(\alpha,\beta)$.*

4.5 A final example

Fix $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{5}{12}]$ and r in $(0, \varepsilon/5)$, we finally construct a non zero-sum HSG Γ satisfying the conditions of theorem 3.4. By proposition 4.9, it is possible to fix α and β such that:

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 1} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} < \varepsilon - 5r \text{ and } \limsup_{\delta\to 1} v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} > \varepsilon + 5r$$

And we define: $\Delta_1 = \{\delta \in [1-2r, 1),\ v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} < \varepsilon - 5r\}$ and $\Delta_2 = \{\delta \in [\frac{1}{1+2r}, 1),\ v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta} > \varepsilon + 5r\}$.

Because we want all payoffs of Γ to be in $[0,1]$, we first modify the zero-sum HSG $\Gamma^*(\alpha,\beta)$ of subsection 4.4 by transforming all payoffs $(1,0)$ into $(1-r, r)$ and all payoffs $(0,1)$ into $(r, 1-r)$. That is, we apply the affine increasing transformation $(x \mapsto r + (1-2r)x)$ to the payoffs, and the game remains constant-sum. We obtain a new HSG Γ_1 with each payoff in $[r, 1-r]$, and the δ-discounted value of this new game is simply $v_\delta = r + (1-2r)v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}$. We also define the HSG Γ_2 as the game Γ_1 where the identity of the players are exchanged: player 1 in Γ_2 plays the role of player 2 in Γ_1, and vice-versa. Plainly, the value of Γ_2 is $1 - v_\delta$.

We now define our final HSG Γ. The states are the 6 states $(1,1), (1,0), (2,1), (2,0), 1^*, 0^*$ of Γ_1, 4 more states[24] corresponding to the states $(1,1), (1,0), (2,1), (2,0)$ of Γ_2, plus 3 extra states k_1, $(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^*$ and $(1-\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon)^*$: k_1 is the initial state and is known to the players, and $(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^*$ and $(1-\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon)^*$ are absorbing states where the payoffs will partly depend on the actions played. Actions sets are $I = \{W_1, J_1\} \times \{T, B\}$ and $J = \{W_2, J_2\} \times \{L, R\}$. Γ is defined as the "independent sum" of two different games played in parallel, the first game evolving according to the first coordinate of the actions, and the second game evolving according to the second coordinate of the actions.

[24] There is no need to duplicate states 0^* and 1^*.

1) At the first period, the actions of the players determine, through their first coordinate[25] a continuation game to be played:

	W_2	J_2
W_1	$(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^*$	Γ_2
J_1	Γ_1	$(1-\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)^*$

If (W_1, W_2), resp. (J_1, J_2) is played in period 1, the game reaches the absorbing state $(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^*$, resp. $(1-\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)^*$. If (W_1, J_2), resp. (J_1, W_2), is played in period 1, then from period 2 on the hidden stochastic game Γ_2, resp. Γ_1, is played. The payoffs of the first game in period 1 are respectively defined as $(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)$, $(1-\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)$, $(0,0)$ and $(0,0)$ if (W_1, W_2), (J_1, J_2), (W_1, J_2) and (J_1, W_2) is played.

2) In addition, at every period of Γ the players play, through the second coordinate of their actions, the following bimatrix game G, independently of everything else.

	L	R
T	r, r	$-r, r$
B	$r, -r$	$-r, -r$

In each period, the payoffs in Γ are the sum of the payoffs of the two games. For instance if the state is $(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^*$ and the second components of the actions are (B, L), then the stage payoffs are $\varepsilon + r$ for player 1 and $\varepsilon - r$ for player 2. If at the first period (J_1, W_2) is played then at any subsequent stage the payoffs of the players are the payoffs in Γ_1 plus the payoffs in G. One can easily check that all payoffs lie in $[0, 1]$.

Past actions are perfectly observed. The public signals are those of Γ_1 or Γ_2 when these games are played, and we add one specific public signal for the initial state and each absorbing state $(\varepsilon,\varepsilon)^*$ and $(1-\varepsilon,1-\varepsilon)^*$, so that Γ has 13 public signals and is a hidden stochastic game with known payoffs. Moreover the game is symmetric between the players.

First notice that in G, each player chooses the payoff of the other player, hence any profile is a Nash equilibrium, and the equilibrium payoff set of G is the square of feasible payoffs $[-r, r]^2$. For each initial probability and discount factor, the modification of Γ where the game G is removed has a sequential equilibrium yielding some payoff (x, y). Combining independently such equilibrium with any sequential equilibrium of the repetition of G gives a sequential equilibrium of Γ. Then the square centered in (x, y) with side $2r$ is included in the set of sequential equilibrium of Γ for this initial probability and discount factor. This proves the third item of theorem 3.4.

[25] At period 1, W_1, W_2, J_1, J_2 should not be interpreted as Wait or Jump.

From now on, we consider the game Γ with initial state k_1. The idea is quite simple: for δ in Δ_1, v_δ will be significantly smaller than ε and all equilibria of Γ will play (W_1, W_2) in the first period; whereas for δ in Δ_2, v_δ will be much greater than ε and all equilibria of Γ will play (J_1, J_2) in period 1.

Proposition 4.11.

1) For δ in Δ_1, $E_\delta = E'_\delta$ is the square $[\varepsilon - r, \varepsilon + r]^2$, and this is also the set of communication equilibria of the δ-discounted game, as well as the set of stationary equilibrium payoffs of the associated stochastic game.

2) For δ in Δ_2, $E_\delta = E'_\delta$ is the square $[1 - \varepsilon - r, 1 - \varepsilon + r]^2$, and this is also the set of communication equilibria of the δ-discounted game, as well as the set of stationary equilibrium payoffs of the associated stochastic game.

Proof: First consider, for any discount δ, the subgame induced by Γ after (J_1, W_2) has been played in period 1, discounted from period 2 on. By playing optimally in the Γ_1 component, player 1 can secure a payoff of $v_\delta - r$, whereas player 2 can secure a payoff of $1 - v_\delta - r$. Since the sum of the payoffs is not greater than $1 + 2r$, all equilibrium payoffs of this subgame lie in the set $[v_\delta - r, v_\delta + 3r] \times [1 - v_\delta - r, 1 - v_\delta + 3r]$. Symmetrically, equilibrium payoffs of the subgame induced by Γ after (J_1, W_2) has been played in period 1, belong to the square $[1 - v_\delta - r, 1 - v_\delta + 3r] \times [v_\delta - r, v_\delta + 3r]$.

1) Fix a discount factor δ in Δ_1. We have $v_\delta = r + (1-2r)v_{\alpha,\beta,\delta}$, so $\delta v_\delta < \varepsilon - 4r$. Consider a Nash equilibrium (σ, τ) of the δ-discounted game Γ, and denote by x, resp. y, the probability that σ plays W_1, resp. τ plays W_2 at stage 1. We will show that $x = y = 1$, and first assume for the sake of contradiction that $x < 1$. By playing W_1 at period 1 and optimally in Γ_2 afterwards, player 1 can get a payoff not lower than:

$$A := y(\varepsilon - r) + (1 - y)(\delta(1 - v_\delta) - r).$$

This should not exceed the payoff obtained against τ by playing J_1 at period 1 and following σ afterwards, and this payoff is not greater than

$$B := y(\delta(v_\delta + 3r) + (1 - \delta)r) + (1 - y)(1 - \varepsilon + r),$$

because if $y > 0$ the continuation strategies after (J_1, W_2) should form a Nash equilibrium of the corresponding subgame. Because $\delta v_\delta < \varepsilon - 2r(1+\delta)$, we obtain that $\varepsilon - r > \delta(v_\delta + 3r) + (1 - \delta)r$. Because $\delta v_\delta < \varepsilon - 4r$ and $\delta \geq 1 - 2r$, we have $\delta v_\delta < \varepsilon - 2r + \delta - 1$, and this implies $\delta(1 - v_\delta) - r > 1 - \varepsilon + r$. Consequently, for all values of y in $[0, 1]$ we have $A > B$, which is a contradiction. Hence we obtain $x = 1$, and by symmetry $y = 1$. All Nash equilibrium of Γ play W_1 and W_2 in period 1, and the set of Nash equilibrium payoffs E_δ is included in the square $[\varepsilon - r, \varepsilon + r]^2$. The players can combine (W_1, W_2) in period 1 with the repetition of any given mixed Nash equilibrium of G, so any point in the square can be achieved at equilibrium, and $E_\delta = [\varepsilon - r, \varepsilon + r]^2$. Considering sequential

equilibria, or introducing a correlation device, even with communication, would not modify the above proof. And this is the same with stationary equilibria of the associated stochastic game with state variable the belief on K. This proves 1) of the proposition.

2) We proceed similarly for δ in Δ_2. We have $v_\delta > r+(1-2r)(\varepsilon+5r) > \varepsilon+4r$, which implies both: $\delta v_\delta > \frac{\varepsilon+4r}{1+2r} > \varepsilon+2r$, and $\delta v_\delta > \delta(\varepsilon+4r) \geq \varepsilon+2r+\delta(1+2r)-1$. Let (σ,τ) be a Nash equilibrium of the δ-discounted game Γ, and with x, resp. y, being the probability that σ plays W_1, resp. τ plays W_2, at period 1. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $x > 0$. By playing W_1 at period 1 and following σ afterwards, the payoff of player 1 against τ is at most:

$$A' := y(\varepsilon + r) + (1 - y)((1 - \delta)r + \delta(1 - v_\delta + 3r)).$$

This should not be lower than the payoff obtained by playing J_1 at period 1 and optimally in Γ_1 afterwards, so not lower than:

$$B' := y((1 - \delta)(-r) + \delta(v_\delta - r)) + (1 - y)(1 - \varepsilon - r).$$

Since $\delta v_\delta > \varepsilon + 2r$ and $\delta v_\delta > \varepsilon + 2r + \delta(1 + 2r) - 1$, we get $B' > A'$, hence a contradiction. We deduce $x = 0$, and by symmetry $y = 0$. And point 2) of the proposition follows.

Since $\varepsilon + r < 1 - \varepsilon - r$, proposition 4.11 clearly implies that no converging selection of $(E_\delta)_\delta$ exists.

We now consider perturbations of the payoffs. Let, for $\eta \in [0, \frac{r(\varepsilon-5r)}{4})$, $\Gamma(\eta)$ be a HSG obtained from Γ by perturbing each payoff by at most η, and denote by $E_\delta(\eta)$, resp. $E'_\delta(\eta)$, the corresponding set of δ-discounted Nash, resp. sequential equilibrium payoffs with initial state k_1.

Proposition 4.12.
1) For all δ in Δ_1, $E_\delta(\eta) \subset [\varepsilon - r - 2\eta, \varepsilon + r + 2\eta]^2$.

Moreover, $\lim_{\eta\to 0} \lim_{\delta\to 1,\delta\in\Delta_1} E'_\delta(\eta) = E_1$, and $\lim_{\delta\to 1,\delta\in\Delta_1} \limsup_{\eta\to 0} d(E_\delta(\eta), E_1) = 0$.

2) For all δ in Δ_2, $E_\delta(\eta) \subset [1 - \varepsilon - r - 2\eta, 1 - \varepsilon + r + 2\eta]^2$.

Moreover, $\lim_{\eta\to 0} \lim_{\delta\to 2,\delta\in\Delta_1} E'_\delta(\eta) = E_2$, and $\lim_{\delta\to 1,\delta\in\Delta_2} \limsup_{\eta\to 0} d(E_\delta(\eta), E_2) = 0$.

3) There is no converging selection $(x_\delta)_\delta$ of $(E_\delta(\eta))_\delta$.

4) The game $\Gamma(\eta)$ has no uniform equilibrium payoff.

The proof is in the Appendix, and concludes the proof of Theorem 3.4.

5 Appendix

Definition 5.1. *Let A be a subset of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^N$. A is semi-algebraic if it is defined by a finite number of polynomial inequalities, i.e. if A is a finite union of sets, each of these sets being defined as the conjunction of finitely many weak or strict polynomial inequalities.*

We believe that the following proposition, which is a direct consequence of the Main Theorem in [15], can be useful in several contexts.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $(W_\delta)_{\delta\in[0,1)}$ be a family of non-empty compact subsets of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^N$. Assume that $\{(\delta, x)|, \delta \in [0,1), x \in W_\delta\}$ is a semi-algebraic subset of $\mathbb{R}^{N+1}$. Then when δ goes to one, W_δ converges for the Hausdorff distance to a non-empty compact subset W of $\mathbb{R}^N$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.1 Let W be the set of $(\delta, x, y, r) \in [0,1)\times\left(\mathbb{R}^I \times \mathbb{R}^J \times \mathbb{R}^2\right)^K$ such that (x, y) is a stationary equilibrium in Γ_δ, and r is the associated payoff equilibrium. Then $(\delta, x, y, r) \in W$ if and only if for all $(k, i, j) \in K \times I \times J$, it satisfies the following inequalities and equalities :

$$\sum_{i'\in I} x^{i'}(k) = 1, \quad x^i(k) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{j'\in J} x^{j'}(k) = 1, \quad y^j(k) \geq 0,$$

$$\sum_{i'\in I} x^{i'}(k)\left((1-\delta)u_2(k,i',j) + \delta\sum_{k'\in K} q^{k'}(k,i',j)r_2(k')\right) \leq r_2(k),$$

$$\sum_{j'\in J} y^{j'}(k)\left((1-\delta)u_1(k,i,j') + \delta\sum_{k'\in K} q^{k'}(k,i,j')r_1(k')\right) \leq r_1(k),$$

$$\sum_{i'\in I}\sum_{j'\in J} x^{i'}(k)y^{j'}(k)\left((1-\delta)u_2(k,i',j') + \delta\sum_{k'\in K} q^{k'}(k,i',j')r_2(k')\right) = r_2(k),$$

$$\sum_{i'\in I}\sum_{j'\in J} x^{i'}(k)y^{j'}(k)\left((1-\delta)u_1(k,i',j') + \delta\sum_{k'\in K} q^{k'}(k,i',j')r_1(k')\right) = r_1(k).$$

Thus W is a semi-algebraic set.

For $\delta \in [0,1)$, let $W_\delta := \left\{(x, y, r) \in \left(\mathbb{R}^I \times \mathbb{R}^J \times \mathbb{R}^2\right)^K \mid (\delta, x, y, r) \in W\right\}$. Then W_δ is non-empty and compact. Applying the preceding proposition, we deduce that (W_δ) converges for the Hausdorff metric when δ goes to 1. In particular, (E''_δ) converges for the Hausdorff metric.

Proof of Proposition 4.5

1) Define $\hat{a} = \hat{a}(\alpha, \delta)$ as the integer part of $a^* = a^*(\alpha, \delta)$, we have $v_{\alpha,\delta} \geq s_{\alpha,\delta}(\hat{a}(\alpha, \delta))$. Since $\hat{a} > a^* - 1$, we have $\alpha^{\hat{a}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}\frac{1}{\alpha} \xrightarrow[\delta\to 1]{} 0$. Since $\hat{a} \leq a^*$, we have $(1-\delta)(\alpha\delta)^{-\hat{a}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}\,\delta^{-a^*} \xrightarrow[\delta\to 1]{} 0$. Consequently, $\lim_{\delta\to 1} s_{\alpha,\delta}(\hat{a}(\alpha, \delta)) = 1$,

which implies that $\lim_{\delta\to 1} v_{\alpha,\delta} = 1$.

We now turn to the proof of conditions 2) and 3) of proposition 4.5, and start with a lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *For all α and δ in $(0,1)$,*

$$1 - 2\,\delta^{-a^*-1}\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} \leq s_{\alpha,\delta}(a^*) \leq 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + 3\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}, \tag{3}$$

$$s_{\alpha,\delta}(a) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha^{1/2}}}\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + \frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}(\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha^{1/2}}). \tag{4}$$

Proof of lemma 5.3: We use $1-\alpha\delta \geq 1-\alpha$ in the fist line below and $\delta^{-a^*-1} \geq 1$ in the third line below to obtain the LHS of (3):

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{\alpha,\delta}(a^*) &\geq \frac{1-\alpha^{a^*}}{1+\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}\alpha^{-a^*}\delta^{-a^*-1}}, \\
&= \frac{1-\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}}{1+\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}\,\delta^{-a^*-1}}, \\
&\geq \frac{1-\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}\,\delta^{-a^*-1}}{1+\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}\,\delta^{-a^*-1}}, \\
&\geq 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}\delta^{-a^*-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For inequality (4), we introduce $l_{\alpha,\delta}(a) = \frac{1-\alpha^a}{1+\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}\alpha^{-a}\delta^{-a-1}}$. If $a \leq a^* - 1/4$, we have $\alpha^a \geq \alpha^{a^*-1/4} = \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}}$, and $l_{\alpha,\delta}(a) \leq 1-\alpha^a \leq 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}}$. If $a \geq a^* + 1/4$, we have $\alpha^{-a} \geq \alpha^{-a^*-1/4}$ and we write:

$$\begin{aligned}
l_{\alpha,\delta}(a) &\leq \frac{1}{1+\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}\alpha^{-a}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1+\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}}} \\
&\leq 1 - \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}} + \frac{1-\delta}{\alpha^{1/2}(1-\alpha)}.
\end{aligned}$$

And inequality (4) is obtained after noticing that:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{\alpha,\delta}(a) &= l_{\alpha,\delta}(a) + (1-\delta)\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}l_{\alpha,\delta}(a) \\
&\leq l_{\alpha,\delta}(a) + (1-\delta)\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude with the RHS of (3). We use $\delta^{-a^*-1} \geq 1$ in the first inequality below, and $\frac{1-x}{1+x} \leq 1 - 2x + 2x^2$ for all $x \geq 0$ in the third inequality below:

$$\begin{aligned} l_{\alpha,\delta}(a^*) &\leq \frac{1-\alpha^{a^*}}{1+\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}\alpha^{-a^*}}, \\ &= \frac{1-\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}}{1+\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}}, \\ &\leq 1 - 2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + 2\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

$s_{\alpha,\delta}(a^*) \leq l_{\alpha,\delta}(a^*) + \frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}$ finally gives the RHS of (3). This concludes the proof of lemma 5.3.

We now prove point (2) of proposition 4.5. Fix $\alpha < 1/4$, we have $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} > 2$ so for δ close enough to 1,

$$2\delta^{-a^*-1} + \sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}(\alpha + 1/\alpha) < \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}},$$

which implies that:

$$1 - 2\,\delta^{-a^*-1}\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} > 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + \frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}(\alpha + 1/\alpha).$$

For $\delta \in \Delta_1(\alpha)$, the a^*-strategy is available in the MDP, and the previous inequality shows that it is an optimal strategy. $v_{\alpha,\delta} = s_{\alpha,\delta}(a^*)$, and (3) of lemma 5.3 implies $\lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_1(\alpha)} \frac{1-v_{\alpha,\delta}}{2\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}}} = 1$.

We finally prove point (3) of proposition 4.5, and consider $\delta \in \Delta_2(\alpha)$. The pure stationary strategies available in the MDP are a-strategies, with $|a - a^*| \geq 1/4$. Point (4) of lemma 5.3 then implies that: $v_{\alpha,\delta} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\sqrt{\frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}} + \frac{1-\delta}{1-\alpha}(\alpha + 1/\alpha^{1/2})$, hence the result.

Proof of Proposition 4.12

For any discount factor, the perturbed game issued from Γ_1 may no longer be zero-sum, but the quantity that player 1 can guarantee (whatever the strategy of the other player) in this game is close to v_δ. More precisely, in the subgame induced by $\Gamma(\eta)$ after (J_1, W_2) has been played in period 1, player 1 can secure a payoff of $v_\delta - r - \eta$, whereas player 2 can secure a payoff of $1 - v_\delta - r - \eta$. Since the sum of the payoffs is now not greater than $1+2r+2\eta$, all equilibrium payoffs of this subgame lie in the set $[v_\delta - r - \eta, v_\delta + 3r + 3\eta] \times [1 - v_\delta - r - \eta, 1 - v_\delta + 3r + 3\eta]$. Symmetrically, all equilibrium payoffs of the subgame induced by $\Gamma(\eta)$ after (W_1, J_2) has been played in period 1, are in the set $[1 - v_\delta - r - \eta, 1 - v_\delta + 3r + 3\eta] \times [v_\delta -$

$r-\eta, v_\delta+3r+3\eta]$.

1) Fix δ in Δ_1, we have $v_\delta < r+(1-2r)(\varepsilon-5r)$ and $\delta \geq 1-2r$. This implies:

$$v_\delta \leq \min\{\varepsilon-4(r+\eta), \varepsilon-2(r+\eta)+\delta-1\}. \tag{5}$$

Mimicking the proof of 1) of proposition 4.11, we obtain $A(\eta) = y(\varepsilon-r-\eta)+(1-y)(\delta(1-v_\delta)-r-\eta)$ and $B(\eta) = y(\delta(v_\delta+3r+3\eta)+(1-\delta)(r+\eta))+(1-y)(1-\varepsilon+r+\eta)$, so that $A(\eta)$ and $B(\eta)$ are obtained from the quantities A and B of that lemma by replacing the payoff r by the payoff $r+\eta$. By inequality (5), we have $A(\eta) > B(\eta)$. This implies that any δ-discounted Nash equilibrium of $\Gamma(\eta)$ plays W_1 and W_2 at the first period, and $E_\delta(\eta) \subset [\varepsilon-r-\eta, \varepsilon+r+\eta]^2$.

Fix now η in $(0, \frac{r(\varepsilon-5r)}{2})$. Define $\Gamma(\eta)(W_1, W_2)$ as the subgame obtained from $\Gamma(\eta)$ after (W_1, W_2) has been played in period 1. $\Gamma(\eta)(W_1, W_2)$ is a repeated game, with stage payoffs η-close to the bimatrix:

	(W_2, L)	(J_2, L)	(W_2, R)	(J_2, R)
(W_1, T)	$r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$	$r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$
(J_1, T)	$r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$	$r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon$
(W_1, B)	$r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$	$r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$
(J_1, B)	$r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$	$r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$	$-r+\varepsilon, -r+\varepsilon$

By the Folk Theorem of Fudenberg and Maskin (1986), the set $E'_\delta(\eta)(W_1, W_2)$ of sequential equilibrium payoffs of $\Gamma(\eta)(W_1, W_2)$ converges, when δ goes to 1, to the set of feasible and individually rational payoffs of this game. And this set now converges, when η goes to 0, to the square $E_1 = [-r+\varepsilon, r+\varepsilon]^2$. Since all sequential equilibria of $\Gamma(\eta)$ play (W_1, W_2) in period 1, we obtain $\lim_{\eta\to 0} \lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_1} E'_\delta(\eta) = E_1$.

Consider now the repetition of the bimatrix game G. Fix $\varepsilon' > 0$, there exists δ' such that for all $\delta \geq \delta'$ and any payoff u in $[-r, r]^2$, there exists a periodic sequence $(i_t, j_t)_t$ of pure action profiles in $\{T, B\} \times \{L, R\}$ such that for all t_0, playing the sequence $(i_t, j_t)_{t\geq t_0}$ yields a δ-discounted payoff ε'-close to u. Assume $u = (u_1, u_2) \in [-r+2\varepsilon', r]^2$ and $\eta < \min\{\varepsilon', \frac{r(\varepsilon-5r)}{2}\}$, we have $u_l - \varepsilon' > -r+\eta$ for each player $l = 1, 2$. For $\delta \in \Delta_1$, $\delta \geq \delta'$, the strategy profile where: (W_1, W_2) is played at stage 1, and for the second component of the actions, the above sequence of pure actions is played, with deviations punished by repeating forever (J_1, J_2), is a Nash equilibrium of the δ-discounted game $\Gamma(\eta)$. Hence $E_\delta(\eta)$ contains a point ε'-close to u, and $d(E_\delta(\eta), E_1) \leq 2\varepsilon'$. So $\limsup_{\eta\to 0} d(E_\delta(\eta), E_1) \leq 2\varepsilon'$, and $\lim_{\delta\to 1, \delta\in\Delta_1} \limsup_{\eta\to 0} d(E_\delta(\eta), E_1) = 0$.

2) For δ in Δ_2, we have $\delta v_\delta > \delta(r+(1-2r)(\varepsilon+5r))$. Since $\eta < \frac{1}{2}(1-\varepsilon-5r)$, we have $r+(1-2r)(\varepsilon+5r) > \varepsilon+4(r+\eta)$, and since $\varepsilon-1+2(r+\eta) < 0$, it

implies $r + (1-2r)(\varepsilon + 5r) > \frac{1}{\delta}(\varepsilon - 1 + 2(r+\eta)) + 1 + 2(r+\eta)$. So:

$$\delta v_\delta > \varepsilon - 1 + 2(r+\eta) + \delta(1 + 2(r+\eta)). \tag{6}$$

Since $\delta \geq \frac{1}{1+2r}$, the above also implies:

$$\delta v_\delta > \varepsilon + 2(r+\eta). \tag{7}$$

We mimick the proof of 2) of proposition 4.11 and obtain quantities $A'(\eta) = y(\varepsilon + r + \eta) + (1-y)((1-\delta)(r+\eta) + \delta(1 - v_\delta + 3r + 3\eta))$, and $B'(\eta) = y((1-\delta)(-r-\eta) + \delta(v_\delta - r - \eta)) + (1-y)(1-\varepsilon - r - \eta)$. And the inequalities (6) and (7) imply that $B'(\eta) > A'(\eta)$, hence any δ-discounted Nash equilibrium of $\Gamma(\eta)$ plays J_1 and J_2 at the first period. The rest of the proof of 2) is similar to the proof of 1).

3) We have $\varepsilon + r + \eta < \varepsilon + r(1 + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon - 5r) < 1/2$ since $r < \varepsilon/5$ and $\varepsilon < 5/12$. Hence there is no converging selection $(x_\delta)_\delta$ of $(E_\delta(\eta))_\delta$.

4) It remains to prove that $\Gamma(\eta)$ has no equilibrium payoff, i.e. that for ε' small enough, there is no strategy profile which is an ε'-equilibrium of all discounted games $\Gamma(\eta)$ with high enough discount factors.

We proceed by contradiction, and assume that for each $\varepsilon' > 0$, on can find a discount $\delta_{\varepsilon'}$ in (0,1), and a strategy profile $(\sigma, \tau) = (\sigma_{\varepsilon'}, \tau_{\varepsilon'})$ which is an ε'-equilibrium of each game $\Gamma(\eta)$ with discount $\delta > \delta_{\varepsilon'}$. Denote by $x = x_{\varepsilon'}$, resp. $y = y_{\varepsilon'}$, the probability that σ plays W_1, resp. τ plays W_2 at stage 1. The δ-discounted payoff of player 1 induced by $(\sigma_\varepsilon, \tau_\varepsilon)$ is by definition:

$$g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau) = I\!E_{\sigma,\tau}\left((1-\delta)\sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\delta^{t-1}u_1(k_t, i_t, j_t)\right).$$

We denote by $g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | W_1, W_2)$ the conditional payoff of player 1 given that (W_1, W_2) is played at period 1, that is:

$$E_{\sigma,\tau}\left((1-\delta)\sum_{t=1}^{\infty}\delta^{t-1}u_1(k_t, i_t, j_t)\middle| (i_1 = (W_1, T) \text{ or } (W_1, B)) \text{ and } (j_1 = (W_2, L) \text{ or } (W_2, R))\right).$$

And we similarly define $g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | W_1, J_2)$, $g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | J_1, W_2)$, $g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | J_1, J_2)$ and similar quantities for player 2's payoff. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau) = \quad & xy g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | W_1, W_2) + x(1-y) g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | W_1, J_2) \\ & + (1-x) y g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | J_1, W_2) + (1-x)(1-y) g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | J_1, J_2). \end{aligned}$$

Because player 1 can secure the payoff v_δ in the game Γ_1, the fact that (σ, τ) is an ε'-equilibrium implies that:

$$g_1^\delta(\sigma, \tau | J_1, W_2) \geq \delta v_\delta - (r+\eta) - \frac{\varepsilon'}{(1-x)y}.$$

Similarly, $g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,J_2) \geq \delta(1-v_\delta)-(r+\eta)-\frac{\varepsilon'}{x(1-y)}$, $g_2^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,J_2) \geq \delta v_\delta-(r+\eta)-\frac{\varepsilon'}{x(1-y)}$, and $g_2^\delta(\sigma,\tau|J_1,W_2) \geq \delta(1-v_\delta)-(r+\eta)-\frac{\varepsilon'}{(1-x)y}$. Since $g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,J_2)+g_2^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,J_2) \leq 1+2r+2\eta$, we obtain:

$$g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,J_2) \leq 1+3(r+\eta)-\delta v_\delta+\frac{\varepsilon'}{x(1-y)} \quad (8)$$

$$g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|J_1,W_2) \leq 1+3(r+\eta)-\delta(1-v_\delta)+\frac{\varepsilon'}{y(1-x)} \quad (9)$$

a) By definition (σ,τ) is an ε'-equilibrium, so playing J_1 at period 1 then optimally afterwards against τ should not increase player1's payoff by more than ε', i.e;

$$y\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|J_1,W_2)+(1-y)\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|J_1,J_2) \leq \varepsilon'+g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau).$$

This implies:

$$xy\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|J_1,W_2)+x(1-y)\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|J_1,J_2) \leq \varepsilon'+xyg_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,W_2)+x(1-y)g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,J_2).$$

We have $g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|W_1,W_2) \leq \varepsilon+r+\eta$, $\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|J_1,W_2) \geq \delta v_\delta-r-\eta$ and $\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|J_1,J_2) \geq 1-\varepsilon-r-\eta$. Together with inequality (8), it implies:

$$xy(\delta v_\delta-r-2\eta)+x(1-y)(1-\varepsilon-r-\eta) \leq 2\varepsilon'+xy(\varepsilon+r+\eta)+x(1-y)(1+3(r+\eta)-\delta v_\delta).$$

Rearranging terms, the above equation is equivalent to:

$$2\varepsilon'+2x(r+\eta)(2-y) \geq x(\delta v_\delta-\varepsilon).$$

$x=x_{\varepsilon'}$ and $y=y_{\varepsilon'}$ depend on ε'. Consider δ in Δ_2, we have $v_\delta > \varepsilon+4(r+\eta)$. So there exists $\varepsilon''>0$, independent from ε', such that for all δ high enough in Δ_2:

$$2\varepsilon'+2x_{\varepsilon'}(r+\eta)(2-y_{\varepsilon'}) \geq 4x_{\varepsilon'}(r+\eta)+x_{\varepsilon'}\varepsilon''.$$

Passing to the limit gives:

$$x_{\varepsilon'} \xrightarrow[\varepsilon'\to 0]{} 0.$$

And by symmetry between the players, we also have $\lim_{\varepsilon'\to 0} y_{\varepsilon'}=0$.

b) We finally write that playing W_1 at period 1 then optimally afterwards against τ should not increase player 1's payoff by more than ε', i.e;

$$y\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|W_1,W_2)+(1-y)\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|W_1,J_2) \leq \varepsilon'+g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau).$$

This implies: $y(1-x)\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|W_1,W_2)+(1-y)(1-x)\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|W_1,J_2)$
$\leq \varepsilon'+(1-x)yg_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|J_1,W_2)+(1-x)(1-y)g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|J_1,J_2)$.

We have $g_1^\delta(\sigma,\tau|J_1,J_2) \leq 1-\varepsilon+r+\eta$, $\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|W_1,W_2) \geq \varepsilon - r - \eta$ and $\sup_{\sigma'} g_1^\delta(\sigma',\tau|W_1,J_2) \geq \delta(1-v_\delta) - r - \eta$. Together with inequality (9), the above implies :

$$2\varepsilon' + 2(r+\eta)(1-x)(1+y) \geq (1-x)(\varepsilon - 1 + \delta(1-v_\delta)).$$

For $\delta \in \Delta_1$, we have $v_\delta < \varepsilon - 4(r+\eta)$ so for all δ high enough in Δ_1: $\varepsilon - 1 + \delta(1-v_\delta) \geq 4(r+\eta)$ and we obtain:

$$\frac{\varepsilon'}{r+\eta} + (1-x)(1+y) \geq 2(1-x).$$

We finally get a contradiction since $\lim_{\varepsilon'\to 0} x = \lim_{\varepsilon'\to 0} y = 0$.

References

[1] Abreu D., D. Pearce et E. Stacchetti. Toward a theory of discounted repeated games with imperfect monitoring. *Econometrica*, 58, 1041–1063, 1990.

[2] Aumann R.J. and L. S. Shapley. Long-term competition—A game theoretic analysis. In N. Megiddo, editor, *Essays on game theory*, pages 1–15. Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1994.

[3] Bewley T. and E. Kohlberg. The asymptotic theory of stochastic games. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **1**:197208, 1976.

[4] Bolte J., S. Gaubert and G. Vigeral. Definable zero-sum stochastic games. arXiv:1301.1967, 2013.

[5] Dutta P.K. A Folk Theorem for stochastic games. *Journal of Economlc Theory*, **66**:1–32, 1995.

[6] Forges F. An Approach to Communication Equilibria. *Econometrica*, 54, 1375–1385, 1986.

[7] Fudenberg D. and E. Maskin. The Folk Theorem in repeated games with discounting or with incomplete information. *Econometrica*, **54**, 533–554, 1986.

[8] Fudenberg D. and D. Levine. An approximate Folk Theorem with imperfect private information. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **54**, 26–47, 1991.

[9] Fudenberg D. and Y. Yamamoto. The folk theorem for irreducible stochastic games with imperfect public monitoring. *Journal of Economic Theory*, **146**, 1664–1683, 2011.

[10] Fudenberg D., D. Levine, and E. Maskin. The folk theorem with imperfect public information. *Econometrica*, 62:997–1039, 1994.

[11] Fudenberg D., D. Levine, and S. Takahashi. Perfect public equilibrium when players are patient. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 61:27–49, 2007.

[12] Georghiou C., Philippou A.N and Philippou G.N. A Generalized Geometric Distribution and some of its Properties. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 1, 171-175, 1983.

[13] Gimbert, H., Renault, J., Sorin, S., Venel, X. and Zielonka, W. On the values of repeated games with signals arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.4248, 2014.

[14] Hörner J., Sugaya T., Takahashi S. and Nicolas Vieille. Recursive Methods in Discounted Stochastic Games: An Algorithm for $\delta \to 1$ and a Folk Theorem. *Econometrica*, **79**, 1277-1318, 2011,

[15] Kocel-Cynk B., Pawlucki W. and Valette A. A short geometric proof that Hausdorff limits are definable in any o-minimal structure. *Advances in Geometry*, 14-1, 49–58, 2014.

[16] Lehrer E. Nash equilibria of n-player repeated games with semi-standard information. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 19, 191–217, 1990.

[17] Lehrer E. On the Equilibrium Payoffs Set of two-Player Repeated Games with Imperfect Monitoring. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 20, 211–226, 1992a.

[18] Lehrer E. Two-player repeated games with nonobservable actions and observable payoffs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 17, 200–224, 1992b.

[19] Mertens J-F., S. Sorin et S. Zamir. Repeated games. CORE discussion paper 9420, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1994.

[20] Myerson R. Multistage games with communication. *Econometrica*, 54, 323–358, 1986.

[21] Neyman A. Real algebraic tools in stochastic games. *Stochastic Games and Applications*. Chapter 6, NATO Science Series, A. Neyman and S. Sorin eds, 2003.

[22] Renault J. and T. Tomala. Communication equilibria in repeated games with imperfect monitoring. *Games and Economic Behavior*. **49**, 313–344, 2004.

[23] Renault J. and T. Tomala. General Properties of Long-Run Supergames. *Dynamic Games and Application*. **1**, 319–350, 2011.

[24] Rubinstein A. Equilibrium in supergames", N.Meggido (ed.), *Essays in Game Theory in Honor of Michael Maschler*, Springer-Verlag, 17-28, 1994.

[25] Shapley L.S. Stochastic games. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the U.S.A.*, 39, 1095-1100, 1953.

[26] Sorin S. On repeated games with complete information. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, **11**, 147–160, 1986.

[27] Sorin S. Asymptotic properties of a non-zero sum stochastic game. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 98:296–303, 1984.

[28] Venel X. Commutative stochastic games. Preprint, 2012.

[29] Wen, Q. The "Folk Theorem" for repeated games with Complete Information. *Econometrica*, **62**, 949–954, 1994.

[30] Vieille N. Two-player stochastic games I: a reduction. *Israël Journal of Mathematics,* 119, 55-91, 2000a.

[31] Vieille N. Two-player stochastic games II: the case of recursive games, *Israël Journal of Mathematics,* 119, 93-126, 2000b.

[32] Ziliotto B. Zero-sum repeated games: counterexamples to the existence of the asymptotic value and the conjecture Maxmin= Lim v_N. arXiv:1305.4778, 2013.